



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

4.62

WIDENER LIBRARY



HX JHJI .

wards

Abl. s Gen.  
of quality

HARVARD UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY OF THE  
CLASSICAL DEPARTMENT



FROM THE LIBRARY OF  
ALBERT ANDREW HOWARD

CLASS OF 1882  
POPE PROFESSOR OF LATIN

RECEIVED NOVEMBER 24, 1928





*Review*

# The Ablative of Quality AND The Genitive of Quality

---

DISSERTATION

Presented for the Degree of Ph. D., Johns Hopkins University

JUNE, 1893

BY

GEORGE VAIL EDWARDS



Howard

# The Ablative of Quality

AND

# The Genitive of Quality

---

DISSERTATION

Presented for the Degree of Ph. D., Johns Hopkins University

JUNE, 1899

BY

GEORGE VAIL EDWARDS

---

NEW YORK:  
THE EVENING POST JOB PRINTING HOUSE, 156 FULTON STREET.  
(EVENING POST BUILDING.)

1900.



*Grav 4.62*

HARVARD UNIVERSITY  
CLASSICAL DEPARTMENT  
FROM THE LIBRARY OF  
ALBERT ANDREW HOWARD  
NOVEMBER 24, 1925

Copyright 1900  
BY GEORGE VAIL EDWARDS.

**TO**  
**MINTON WARREN**  
**AND**  
**EDWARD WOELFFLIN**

in grateful recognition  
of many kindnesses greater than the Author can ever hope to repay  
this work is inscribed



# CONTENTS.

## CHAPTER I.

### INTRODUCTION.

	PAGE.
Attitudes of Ancient and Modern Grammarians.....	9
Steps of Progress with Ablatives since 1867 .....	9
<i>a.</i> Delbrück.	
<i>b.</i> Ebrard.	
<i>c.</i> Stegman.	
<i>d.</i> Golling.	
Golling's Summary.....	10
<i>a.</i> Origin of Abl. Qualitatis.	
<i>b.</i> Character at Earliest Appearance.	
<i>c.</i> Distinction between Abl. Qualitatis and Separativus.	
<i>d.</i> Distinction between Abl. Qualitatis and Abl. Modi.	
<i>e.</i> Distinction between Abl. Qualitatis and Abl. Absolutus.	
<i>f.</i> Steps of Development for Adverbial to Adjective Sociative.	
<i>g.</i> Fault of Delbrück's Phraseology.	
<i>h.</i> Fundamental difference between Abl. Qual. and Gen. Qualitatis.	
<i>i.</i> Requirements for Further Progress.	
Progress with Genitives.....	12
<i>a.</i> Bell's View.	
<i>b.</i> Delbrück's Suggestions.	
Scope of Present Work.....	13
Some Results... ..	13
<i>a.</i> The Historical Development of the Construction.	
<i>b.</i> Traces of Greek Influence.	
<i>c.</i> Changes in the Meaning of Words.	

## CHAPTER II.

### INFLUENCE OF FORM.

	PAGE.
A Genitive vis is Wanting .....	16
Faciei and Speciei Avoided .....	16
<i>a.</i> Faciei Etymologically Uncertain.	
<i>b.</i> Forma Contrasted.	
<i>c.</i> Speciei Uncertain.	
<i>d.</i> Other Nouns of 5th Decl.	
Genitive paris avoided .....	27
Genitives of Adjectives in is Comparatively Rare.....	30
The Rhyme orum-orum.....	35
Effect of Hexameter.....	39
<i>a.</i> Corpore.	
<i>b.</i> Pondere.	

---

## CHAPTER III.

### ABLATIVE AND GENITIVE SIDE BY SIDE.

General Remarks .....	46
Special Instances:	
1. Plaut.      Vid. Frag. v: 42.....	48
2. Ter.        Adel.        441.....	49
3. Cic.        Verr.        5, 30.....	49
4.            Verr.        4, 118.....	50
5.            De Div.      2, 88.....	51
6.            Arch.        31.....	51
7.            Fam.        1, 7, 11.....	52
8.            Q. Fr.      2, 9, 4.....	53
9.            De Leg.     3, 45.....	54
10.          Brut.        237.....	55
11.          Fam.        4, 8, 1.....	57
12.          N. D.        2, 48.....	58
13.          Phil.        2, 13.....	59
14.          Att.        14, 14, 2.....	59
15. Cæs.      B. G.        7, 39.....	60
16. Nep.      Dat.        3, 1.....	60
17. Sall.      Hist.        2, 16.....	61
18. Liv.                 1, 11, 8.....	63

		PAGE
19.	6, 22, 7.....	63
20.	27, 19, 8.....	64
21.	30, 4, 1.....	64
22.	31, 21, 6.....	65
23.	38, 24, 2.....	65
24. Val. Max.	1, 7, 7.....	65
25. Plin.	7, 24.....	66
26.	11, 274.....	66
27.	12, 46.....	66
28.	12, 56.....	66
29.	25, 74.....	66
30.	25, 110.....	66
31.	27, 44.....	66
32.	27, 83.....	66
33.	27, 115.....	66
34.	27, 118.....	66
35.	27, 122.....	67
36.	31, 47.....	67
37.	21, 23.....	68
38.	12, 47.....	68
39.	12, 56.....	68
40.	21, 25.....	68
41.	19, 127.....	69
42.	21, 154.....	69
43.	26, 37.....	69
44.	27, 125.....	69
45.	10, 8.....	69
46.	9, 54.....	70
47.	18, 37.....	70
48.	8, 214.....	71
49. Tac.	1, 14.....	71
50.	2, 64.....	71
51.	4, 15.....	71
52.	4, 29.....	72
53.	6, 5.....	73
54.	4, 61.....	73
55.	6, 15.....	73
56.	6, 31.....	73
57.	5, 1.....	74
58.	12, 2.....	74
59.	13, 54.....	74

		PAGE
60.	15, 38.....	74
61. Fronto	Ad M. Cæs. 2, 5.....	75
62. Gellius.	1, 15, 9.....	75
63.	3, 16, 4.....	76
64.	9, 4, 6.....	76
65.	9, 4, 9.....	76
66.	14, 2, 6.....	76
67.	17, 9, 7.....	77
68.	17, 19, 3.....	77
69.	19, 9, 1.....	77
70.	19, 9, 2.....	77
71. S. H. A.	Hadr. 10, 6.....	78
72.	Ant. Pi. 2, 1.....	78
73.	Pesc. 6, 5.....	79
74.	Tyr. 30, 15.....	79
75. Firm. Mat.	3, 3, 10.....	79
76.	3, 10, 9.....	79
77.	4, 19, 5.....	79
78. Aur. Vict.	Cæs. 18.....	80
79. Pallad.	3, 26, 1.....	80
80.	4, 11, 2.....	80
81.	4, 11, 4.....	80
82.	4, 11, 5.....	80
83.	4, 14, 1.....	80
84.	4, 14, 3.....	80
85.	7, 7, 7.....	81
86.	8, 4 2.....	81
87.	12, 13, 7.....	81
88.	12, 13, 7.....	81
89. Scr. Phys.	Pol. p. 188, 21 (Foerst).....	82
90.	238, 15.....	82
91.	272, 3.....	82
92.	Anon. 4, 5 (F. Vol. II.).....	83
93.	4, 92.....	83
94.	4, 94.....	83
95.	4, 107.....	83
96.	4, 110.....	83
97.	4, 124.....	83
98.	4, 130.....	83
99.	Pseud. Pol. 5 A, 14.....	84
100.	Bart. 39, 9.....	84

## CHAPTER I.

---

### INTRODUCTION.

Since the days of Priscian the attention of grammarians has been drawn by the apparent coincidence of function between the ablative and the genitive in phrases such as *magna virtute vir* and *magnæ virtutis vir*. The ancient grammarians cared less for reasons than for facts, and so Priscian (III Keil, 221, 10; 214, 7; 360, 1) is content to observe the occurrence of these expressions without deeper explanation than is implied in his comparison of them with the Greek genitives like *μεγάλῃς ἀρετῇς ἀνὴρ*.

The modern grammarians, on the other hand, have sought to solve many questions about these constructions, such as their origin, their primitive nature, the limitations appearing in the use of each, the extent of their difference or of their equivalence with one another; but the success of these efforts has not been such as to yield a concise and accurate expression of the whole truth. Indeed the newest American school grammars—for instance, Lane's—seem driven back fairly to the ancient standpoint, the mere statement of the most obvious fact.

Notwithstanding this failure to reach unanimity upon all points, the past century has brought an advance in our knowledge of the constructions before us. So long as we designated the two constructions by a common adjective, *qualitatis*, we had in the very name a source of confusion to our ideas, which was in no wise removed when Madvig (Gram. § 287) applied the new titles “*der beschreibende Genetiv, der beschreibende Ablativ*,” to the old constructions. If there is really a fundamental difference between these two cases, then we may have a gain still to make through a distinction in names, just as in the case of two other constructions bearing a common appellation we have made a gain recently by distinguishing them as the ablative of price and the genitive of value (cf. Archiv. IX. 101, ff.).

A great step in the advance toward a perception of the fundamental nature of the Ablative of Quality was taken with Delbrück's dissertation “*Ablativus Localis Instrumentalis*” (Berl., 1867), in



which the ablative was distinguished as a compound case made up of three elements, a separativus, a locativus and an instrumentalis, the last, in turn, composed of two categories; first, "der sociative instrumentalis"; second, "der instrumentalis des Mittels."

This step brought a new point of view, and to make it fruitful it was necessary to consider next some large collection of examples. Ebrard took up this task in his dissertation, "De Ablativi Locativi Instrumentalis . . . Usu," discussing a collection of instances from Plautus and the early Latin, which is large, though for Plautus very far from complete. Next followed Stegmann (*Neue Jahrb.*, 132, p. 243 ff., & 136 p. 252 ff.) with a more exhaustive collection of the examples from Cæsar and Cicero, except the letters. Shortly after Stegmann came Golling's treatise in "Gymnasium" (Vol. 6, Nos. 1 & 2), which is the broadest discussion of the Ablative of Quality that has yet appeared. The main points of Golling's discussion are of sufficient importance to warrant their recapitulation here.

To Golling it appears, first, that the Ablative of Quality has its origin in what Delbrück calls "der sociative instrumentalis"; second, its character as it first appears in Latin is distinctly that of sociativus. This does not overlook the fact that in some instances the idea of the separativus lies very close at hand; for instance, with the ablative of quality *summo genere esse* compare the expression *summo genere gnatus esse*.

Another distinction, not always easily drawn, is that between the Ablative of Quality and the Ablative of Manner, because the accompaniment of a subject in action very often may be felt as an accompaniment of the action; thus, for instance, Tac. Germ. 43, *præsidet sacerdos muliebri ornatu* is not easy to classify. Golling's distinction here is that this ablative remains an Ablative of Quality only so long as its definite connection with the subject is felt; but once having granted that, it will not be necessary to deny the qualitative character of the ablative in order to recognize the modal force which it has also.

The qualitative ablative includes, further, many expressions which might be looked upon from another point of view as Ablative Absolutes, of which Golling gives abundant illustrations; for instance, Cæs. B. G. 5, 14, 3: *Britanni sunt capillo promisso atque omni parte corporis rasa præter caput et labrum superius*; or Plaut. Capt. 789: *conlecto quidem est pallio*.

Concerning the steps of development by which from an original adverbial sociative the ablativus qualitatis (an adjective sociative) was reached, Golling adopts the view in which Krüger has preceded Delbrück, that out of such expressions as *legiones profectæ sunt alacri animo*, or *pugnare æquo fronte*, arose *pugnatio æquo fronte*, or *legiones sunt alacri animo*, whence *legiðnes alacri animo*. Golling has not fallen upon the unfortunate example, *serpens immani corpore incedit*, which Delbrück has since used for illustration of this view, to the misleading of Bennett, who in his Appendix, § 345, follows Delbrück. *Incedit* is a verb which Roman writers never used with *serpens*, its action implying a different motion from that possible to the snake.

Neither does Golling adopt the phraseology of Delbrück, who, in view of the transient character of most instances of this ablative and its contrast in that very particular with the Genitive of Quality, cannot be credited with having invented an illuminating title when he named this construction "der Instrumentalis der dauerenden Eigenschaft."

Concerning the nature of the difference between the Ablative of Quality and the Genitive of Quality, Golling favors the view of Krüger (Gram., § 398, 1). "Durch den Gen. wird ein Gegenstand dargestellt wie er (nach der Ansicht des Redenden) *ist*, durch den Ablativ, *wie er sich zeigt*." "Die Frage nach der Ausbreitung des einen und des anderen Kasus," says Golling, "ist hiermit entschieden. Jedes Merkmal eines Begriffes kann als seine Begleitung, in welche er erscheint, aufgefasst werden, d. h. jeder Gen. qual. wird im Allg. durch den Abl. vertreten werden können, dagegen wird umgekehrt nur zufällig hie und da, was als begleitendes Moment eines Begriffes erscheint, ein Merkmal darstellen." This dictum of Krüger's and of Golling's reads very well, but it is open to the instant objection that every scholar may have his own view of what the "Ansicht des Redenden" was, and accordingly we may be left no nearer a solution of our problem than we were before. Take, for instance, Cic. Fam. 4, 8, 1, *neque monere te audeo præstanti prudentia virum nec confirmare maximi animi hominem*. Kühner translates, "Der du vorzügliche Klugheit zeigt, aber maximi animi von dem ganzen charakter," thus agreeing with Krüger. Madvig, on the other hand, declares that there is no difference; agreeing with Zumpt. Draeger thinks the variation appears not "nach der

Ansicht des Redenden," but "nur der Abwechslungen wegen." Notwithstanding the difficulties which attend such a subjective interpretation of the difference between Ablative and Genitive, it may be said, at least, that no other distinction comes very much nearer to meeting the facts of the situation; for if we set out on the basis that the Genitive denotes *internal* qualities, the ablative *external*, we shall speedily fall through; and on the basis that the genitive denotes the *permanent* quality, the Ablative the *transient*, we shall still find contradiction at every period of the language, from Plautus to Prudentius.

If these inconsistencies are to receive an explanation it must be at the cost of a much larger collection of instances than any which has hitherto been brought together. Golling sees in this direction the light of hope and calls for an investigation of the entire course of this construction, "mit jener Vollständigkeit wie sie Ebrard für die Älteste Sprache erreicht hat."

Even had we at hand the complete collection of Ablatives which Golling desires, that would not suffice for the solution of our problems, for with the discussion of the Ablative of Quality, that of the Genitive of Quality goes hand in hand. For the Genitive not so much discussion has taken place as for the Ablative, nor is the construction in general so well understood. A. Bell, "De Locativi in Prisca Latinitate Vi et Usu" (Breslau, 1889), has sought to show a locative origin for the Genitive of Quality; his argument being (p. 49) that the earliest Genitives of Quality (compounds of *modi*, *pretii*, *generis*) were made with the locative pronouns, *hic*, *illi*, *isti*, etc., which afterwards, looked upon as genitives, led to the employment by their side of the real genitives *huius*, *illius*, *istius*, etc. Thus, beside *isti modi*, Plaut. Truc., 930, appeared *istius modi*, Pl. Epid., 119, etc. This view has not been generally accepted, but Bell's collection of examples is valuable, well supplementing that of Edw. Loch, de Genetivi apud Priscos Usu (1880). The prevailing view of the origin of the Genitive of Quality ascribes it to the possessive, with Krüger (Gram., § 339), though Delbrück's suggestions (Vergl. Synt., § 164 and § 171), that the genitivus qualitatis "vielleicht nicht indogermanisch ist" and "nicht unwahrscheinlich sich nach Auflösung der alten Komposita entwickelt hat" indicate the uncertainty still felt about its source.

It is in the hope of adding something of value to both these

discussions, in the direction which Golling for the Ablative suggests, that the present work has been undertaken. Where so many of the keenest scholars have so long failed to find a simple, unexceptionable rule for distinguishing these constructions it was not hoped to discover one now; but one result at least was certain to attend the consideration of a great collection of examples drawn from all periods of the literature, and that, an oversight of the constructions in their historical development such as no one has hitherto enjoyed.

Following this purpose the author has read through Livy, Velleius, both Senecas, Tacitus, Fronto, Justinus, Gellius, Apuleius, Firmicus Maternus, Palladius and the *Scriptores Physiognomici*, gathering thus the examples from these writers of which there have been extant no collections at all. By an independent reading also the author has gathered from Plautus and Terence double the number of examples cited by Ebrard, several from Nepos, overlooked by Lupus, all those from Cicero's letters and those from Vergil's *Æneid*.

The examples to be cited from the early poets, from Cato, Varro, Cæsar, Cicero's Orations and Philosophical Works, Sallust, Catullus, Horace, Tibullus, Propertius, Ovid, Valerius, Curtius, Pliny the Elder, Phædrus, Pomponius Mela, Petronius, Statius, Quintilian, Juvenal, Suetonius, Granius Licinianus, Lactantius, Eutropius, Aurelius Victor, *Scriptores Historiæ Augustæ*, Ammianus Marcellinus, Prudentius and others, have been collected through the use of treatises, special lexicons and indices verborum, cross references and the contributions of friends. The total number of instances thus collected is considerably above three thousand.

The first result of this investigation to become apparent was the clear determination of several steps in the historical development of the construction; a result not unexpected, and already hinted at by Golling, Joh. Müller and others, but never before so clearly displayed. To undertake a full discussion of this development; of the scope of each construction in the time of Plautus, the extensions introduced by Lucretius and Cicero, the points of development and decay appearing in Livy and the Silver writers, and the later confusion of types, would require a treatise. Suffice it here to make a brief statement of the most obvious facts and then to proceed to the discussion of some results which were not to the same degree anticipated.

In early Latin our Ablative was largely the case for physical

descriptions and held this domain almost to the exclusion of the Genitive, which, aside from compounds of *modi*, *generis* and *pretii* was confined to a few unusual and mostly figurative expressions. Lucretius had new ideas, of a less concrete sort, to express and he used the Ablative. In Cicero's time the range of ideas to be exactly expressed was greatly amplified in the direction of abstract qualities, and the Ablative, accordingly, extended its function; but now the Genitive, as the "of" case, opposed to the Ablative, as the "with" case, seemed more fitted to the expression of the deeper-seated qualities, and Cicero extended its use to include many new expressions, mostly of abstract qualities, involving the adjectives *summus*, *magnus*, *maximus* and *tantus*, and a few others. These developments, occurring within the long period of Cicero's literary activity, have given to his usage an apparent inconsistency which has had double effect upon the opinion of grammarians who looked to Cicero as the pattern of style. Cæsar, writing during a more limited period, does not show the same inconsistency. With Livy a new force appears. The Genitive is left to follow its own extension within the lines already drawn, but the Ablative, as the old-fashioned case, gets gradually forsaken. For the ideas which the Ablative has expressed new adjectives are employed, and by the time of Velleius and Valerius the abandonment of the Ablative became almost complete. When the reaction from this impulse set in the return was plainly to an inconsistent model. Gellius chose to express with these constructions few ideas which had not already received the stamp of ablative or genitive; but, where at one period the Ablative had been used and at a later period the Genitive for very similar ideas, Gellius had free choice which analogy to follow, and most often, though not uniformly, took the Ablative. Not all the later writers shared the archaistic tendency of Gellius, but the course of the constructions remained much the same until with the writers of the last half of the fourth century the old distinctions were forgotten and each writer followed new ones for himself.

When we seek to explain the instances collected as the results of the forces indicated above, namely, first, a logical development of each construction on the basis of its fundamental nature, the ablative being the "with" case, the genitive the "of" case; second, the effect, through the operation of analogy, of the development of the Ablative so early, compared with that of the Genitive; and third, the

intentional variation from a preceding type of style by the Silver writers and again by Gellius and his successors, much will become clear, but we shall still find ourselves often at a loss.

The general character of the difference between the cases, though hard to state in a form which will always apply, is, nevertheless, too clearly felt to be denied. Indeed, the usage is so regular, that when apparent exceptions occur we may well inquire if they be not due to the operation of some special causes not yet fully understood.

A few such causes suggest themselves readily; for instance, we should expect to find some influence exerted through the intimacy of the Romans with Greek. That the Latin Genitive of Quality is an imitation of the Greek, Brenous, *Les Hellénismes dans la syntaxe Latine*, p. 97, denies. Nevertheless, we shall see that the effects of Greek influence are not altogether lacking, in particular in the Latin translations of Greek compounds with *πόλυ-* and *'ε-*

Again, a change in the meaning of words may have been of influence. This is the case with *animo*. In Plautus *animus* signifies chiefly the spirits, and so the common ablative phrases are *bono, tranquillo, quieto, liquido animo*. By Cicero's time the word had gained in meaning; and while Cicero kept, for the most part, the ablative in such combinations as *ægro, altiore, anxio, angusto, consulari, excelso, firmo, forti, hostili, ieiuno, imbecillo, infirmo, inhumano, mobili, mansueto, magno, maximo, parvo, pravo, pari, sapienti, simplici, singulari, stabili animo*, yet when the meaning intended was that of a permanent characteristic and not of the passing mood or spirits, the genitive (*magni, maximi animi*, cf. *μεγαλόφυκος, μέγας θυμος*) was logically required and often so appeared. That Terence felt the beginnings of this change in meaning, we may infer from his phrases *incerto, virili, leni, duro, comi, amico, fidei, benigno, pervicaci animo*.

## CHAPTER II.

### THE INFLUENCE OF FORM.

The first to be considered of the instances in which the usage of the qualitatis constructions has been affected by the limitations of etymological forms may be the noun *vis*. The Ablative of Quality with *vi* is frequent enough, but had a writer wished to express an idea for which the genitive of this noun were more precisely adapted, he would have been met at once with the fact that, not only for the Genitive of Quality, but for every other construction of the genitive, a form *vis* was lacking in Latin even until the beginning of the third century A. D. Writers were accordingly driven to the disuse of the genitive *vis* or to the substitution for it of a synonymous adjective, or the ablative *vi*. The following instances of *vi* appear :

Plaut. Truc., Arg. 5: *vi magna servos est ac trucibus moribus*.  
Sall. Cat. 5, 1: *Catilina fuit magna vi et animi et corporis*. A phrase repeated in connection with a difficult individual by

Anon. De Viris Illustribus, 76: *Mithridates, magna vi animi et corporis*.

Plin. N. H. 2, 39: *simili ratione, sed nequaquam magnitudine aut vi*.

8, 38 *excellenti vi et velocitate uros*.

24, 110 *purpurea . . . vis summa ad refrigerandum est*  
|| *vis dEXv. vi VG* ||.

34, 154 *squama acriore vi quam robigo*.

As the second instance of the influence of etymological forms we may take the genitives of nouns of the fifth declension. For the first example, the genitive of *facies*. The form of this genitive written in modern texts is *faciei*, like *rei*, *spei*, *diei*; but in early Latin and even in classical Latin the form is not sure. In Neue's Formenlehre, pages 375 ff. are cited the instances to show that in the early language the genitive of nouns of the fifth declension was in *-es*, like the nominative, beside which later appeared a genitive in *-ei*, which could be also contracted to *-e*, or contracted to *-i*. Gellius (9. 14) is one of the witnesses that Cæsar preferred the form in *-e*, (Cæsar in libro de analogia secunda huius *die* et huius *specie* dicendum

putat), whereas Claud. Quadrig. had preferred the form in *-es*, "*huius facies*," "*propter magnitudinem facies*."

Now, if a Latin writer used the genitive form *facies*, it was in danger of being confused with the nominative singular, or with the nominative and accusative plural. If he used *facie*, then it coincided with the ablative. For some reason *facii* never came into general use; and the remaining form *faciei*, coinciding with the dative, was also, perhaps for that reason, not satisfactory. How long this variety of forms persisted in Roman usage we cannot state with precision. The regularity of modern texts in reading the genitive *faciei* may possibly be due to scribes' corrections of forms which the authors wrote in *-es* or *-ie*, but which seemed to the scribes merely errors. Another possibility is that some writers may have used a Genitive of Quality with the form *facie*, which the copyist corrected to an Ablative of Quality by altering the case of the adjective in agreement, supposing the gen. *facie*, which the author wrote to be an ablative.

These are mere possibilities. The examples show for centuries no attempt at a Genitive of Quality, but only the Ablative, and that very frequent from Plautus on.

Plaut.	Asin.	353	neque qua facie sit scio.
		399	Qua facie voster Saurea est?
	Capt.	646	Sed qua faciest tuos sodalis Philocrates?
	Pers.	547	sat edepol concinnast facie.
	Poen.	1111	Nutrix qua sit facie.
	Pseud.	724	Qua facie?
		1217	Eho tu, qua facie fuit . . . ?
	Rud.	316	Nullum istac facie ut prædicas venisse.
		565	Qua sunt facie? Scep.—Scitula.
		1149	dicito quid insit et qua facie.
		1155	Qua facie sunt?
			(Not once have we cuius sit faciei.)
Pacuv.	Niptra Frg.	7,	Ribb, 254 facie procera virum.
Ter.	Eun.	230	(virginem) Facie honesta.
		473	Quam liberali facie quam ætate integra.
		682	(ille erat) Honest a facie et liberali.
	Hec.	441	cadaverosa facie.
	Phor.	100	virgo ipsa facie egregia.
Cicero	Tusc.	1, 67,	qua facie . . . (animus) sit aut ubi habitat.



	Nat. Deor.	1, 81,	deos ea facie novimus qua pictores fictoresque voluerunt.
	De Div.	1, 53	ei visum in quiete egregia facie iuvenem.
	Phil.	2, 41,	Turselius qua facie fuerit.
Sall.	Jug.	6,	decora facie.
Nepos	Datames	3, 1,	Thuyn, hominem maximi corporis terribilique facie.

Note that Nepos was unable to balance his first genitive *corporis* with a second, because a Genitive of Quality from *facies* was not in use.

More remarkable than this unanimity of the classical writers in the use of *facie* is its exclusive use by the writers of Silver Latin who showed otherwise the greatest preference for the genitive construction.

	Liv.	1, 55, 5,	caput humanum integra facie . . . aperientibus . . . aperuisse.
	Val. Max.	1. ext. 16,	eximia facie puerum.
	Phædr.	3, 4, 7,	formosos . . . et turpi facie multos.
	Plin. Nat. H.	17, 229,	arborem turpi facie relinquunt.
		34, 60,	hic supra dicto facie quoque indiscreta similis fuisse.
			[facile quoque et discreta B.]
		34, 93	(statua) sola eo habitu Romæ, torva facie,
	Suet. vita Verg. (Donat.)		corpore statura grandi, aquilo colore, facie rusticana valetudine varia.
	Fronto Ad Ant.	1, 3,	pullulos duos tam simili facie sibi.
		2, 6,	pollens viribus decora facie.
	Laudes Neg.	7,	ut quæque mulier magis facie freta est.
	Bell. Parth.		facie eximia lapidem.
	Gell.	2, 23, 8,	ancillam facie haud illiberali.
		4, 11, 14,	feminam pulcra facie.
		7 (6), 8, 2,	facie incluta mulierem.
		9, 4, 6,	qua fuisse facie cyclopas poetæ ferunt.
		13, 30 (29), 3,	ætate integra, feroci ingenio facie procera virum.
	[Cited by Gell. from Pacuvius Niptra Trag. frag. 254, cf. above.]		
		13, 30 (29), 6,	Verba Plauti hæc sunt . . . qua sit facie mi expedi.

		15, 12, 2, pueri eximia facie.
		17, 10, 3, partus recentes rudi esse facie et imperfecta.
Apul.	Met.	11, 246, Nunc atra nunc aurea facie sublimis.
	Met.	9, 177, puer mobili ac trepida facie.
Polemo	de physiogn.	55, facie magna oculis umidis.
		59, carnosâ fronte, carnosâ facie.
		194, 6, Foerst. crinibus nigris angustiore facie.

We see, then, that in early, classical and Silver Latin the Genitive does not appear; for the fragment from Claudius Quadrig. quoted by Gellius (9, 14) "huius facies" does not offer us a Genitive of Quality, but merely a form out of construction for the sake of illustration, and the conjecture of Detlefsen to Plin. N. Hist., 2, 90, specieque humanæ faciei effigiem cannot be accepted in place of the MSS. reading specie humana Dei.

It is when we come to the tasteless writers of the later time that we first find faciei, which does appear several times in the Latin translation of Bartholomæus de Messana, and once in Polemo.

Bart. de Mess. 35 (Physiogn. I., p. 41, 8 Foerst.) tristes obscuræ faciei sunt.

40 (Phys. p. 49, 5 F.) est femina . . . angustioris faciei.

35 (Phys. p. 37, 6 F.) parvæ faciei.

Polemo 35 (Phys. I, 242, 13 F.) staturæ erectæ, pulchræ faciei.

Two objections may be raised to the argument that this exclusion of faciei is due to its etymological form. First, it may be said that the Genitive was not used because no writer wished to express that particular form of this idea for which he felt the Genitive would be better adapted than the Ablative. Second, that the frequent and exclusive use of the Ablative of Quality facie in the early poets fixed its form forever, making it felt as a formula, not to be altered.

Both these objections are met by a consideration of the usage of *forma*. *Forma* and *facies* are very similar, not only in meaning, but in sound and appearance. Alliteration helped to make the ideas more closely connected in the Latin mind. "Forma et facie" says Nævius, Trag. 4. Plautus, Miles, 1027 turns the same phrase, and Lucretius follows, De Nat. 5, 1263, and 5. 1176. Quite as Shakspeare, with the same alliteration, says, Hamlet, 3. 1, "form and feature."

Moreover, Plautus and Terence use *forma* and *facie* almost interchangeably in corresponding phrases. Compare Pl. Amph. 614 *forma ætate item*, Qua ego sum and Merc. 638, Qua *forma esse aiebant?* with Pl. Asin. 399 *Qua facie voster Saurea est?* and the like. Compare Ter. Andr. 72, *egregia forma*, with Ter. Phorm. 100 *facie egregia*; Ter. Eun. 132 *forma honesta*, with Ter. Eun. 230 *Facie honesta*; Ter. Andr. 122 *forma Honesta ac liberali*, with Eun. 473 *liberali facie*, and with Eun. 682 *Honesta facie et liberali*.

If it is true that the idea of *facies* is one which does not readily suggest itself as fitted for the genitive form, then *forma* also will not appear in the genitive; and if the early prevalence of the ablative *facie* has fixed its use, then the use of *forma* will be fixed likewise, provided *forma* is similarly prevalent in the early literature. The early prevalence of *forma* will appear from the following record:

Plaut.	Amph.	316	Alia forma esse.
		614	forma. . . Qua sum.
	Epid.	43	forma lepida ac liberali.
	Men. Pl.	19	forma simili.
	Merc Arg.	2	scita forma mulierem.
		13	forma eximia mulierem.
		210	forma eximia mulierem.
		260	forma eximia mulierem.
		414	forma mala.
		638	Qua forma.
	Mil.	10	forma regia.
		782	forma lepida mulierem.
		871	lepida forma.
		967	lepida ac liberali forma.
	Pers.	130	forma lepida ac liberali.
		521	forma expetenda.
	Rud.	894	forma scitula atque ætatula.
	Stich.	381	forma eximia.
Pacuv.	Medus (Ribb.	231)	(cited by Priscian I. 30, 87).
			Mulier egregissima forma.
Ter.	Andr.	72	egregia forma.
		119	Forma bona.
		122	forma Honesta ac liberali.
		428	forma bona.
	Heaut.	523	forma luculenta.
	Eun.	132	forma honesta.
		361	Estne, ut fertur, forma?
		366	Summa forma.
Lucr.	De Rer.	2, 414	Simili forma.

- 5, 825 variantibus formis.  
 4, 1, 279 deteriora forma.  
 Cæs. B. G. 3, 14, 5 absimili forma.  
 B. G. 7, 23, 1 hac fere forma sunt.  
 ||haec fere forma est B||.  
 Cic. Rep. 6, 10 ea forma:  
 N. D. 1, 90 Ante igitur humana forma.  
 quam homines ea qua.  
 ||eaeque|| erant f. di immortales.  
 1, 107 nec ea forma qua illi fuerunt.  
 Tim. 17 ea forma.  
 Tusc. 5, 61 eximia forma.  
 Verr. 4, 129 eadem . . forma.  
 Nepos Iph. 3, 1 imperatoriaque forma.

So far the ablative exclusively. Manifestly the early prevalence of forma is even greater than that of facie; and its use continues.

- Verg. Æn. 8, 208 forma superante.  
 Ovid Met. 3, 607 forma virginea.  
 9, 330 forma notissima.  
 15, 130 forma præstantissima.  
 Rem. 475 forma proxima.  
 Her. 3, 35 forma præstanti.  
 Liv. 26, 50, 1 eximia forma.  
 27, 19, 8 forma insigni.  
 38, 24, 2 forma eximia.  
 Petron. 105 mirabili forma.  
 Plin. N. H. 7, 184 præcellente forma.  
 10, 51 dilecta forma.  
 19, 65 qua forma.  
 19, 70 qua forma.  
 34, 19 maxima forma.  
 34, 78 eximia forma.  
 35, 17 excellentissima forma.  
 36, 188 forma terrena.  
 Suet. Aug. 79 forma eximia.  
 Nero 1 augustiore forma.  
 Titus 3 forma egregia.  
 Gell. 2, 18, 3 forma liberali.  
 5, 8, 9 pari forma.  
 6 (7), 8, 3 forma liberali.  
 7 (6), 8, 3 forma egregia.  
 7 (6), 8, 3 exsuperanti forma.  
 14, 1, 5 quaque forma.  
 14, 4, 2 forma virginali.  
 15, 30, 3 quali forma.

17, 1, 8 *quali forma*.

17, 1, 8 *quali forma nasceretur*.

Tac. Ann. 2, 39, 10 *forma haud dissimili*.

Observe, now, that with the Augustan poets a Genitive *formæ* begins to appear.

Hor. Sat. 2, 7, 52 *ne ditior aut formæ melioris meiat eodem*  
(perhaps *melioris* here metri causa).

Ovid, Trist. 3, 14, 19 *sunt quoque mutatæ ter quinque volumina formæ*.

Then with Livy and the Silver writers the use of the Genitive becomes extended; for Valerius, Seneca, Curtius, Justinus and Apuleius totally excluding the Ablative *forma*.

Liv. 22, 46, 5 *scuta eiusdem formæ* (following the analogy of *eiusmodi*).

36, 43, 8 *minoris formæ naves erant*.

37, 23, 5 *maioris formæ navium*.

37, 30, 2 *maximæ formæ naves*.

44, 28, 15 *viginti eximiæ eqvos formæ*.

Val. Max. 3, 8 Ext. 4 *excellentis formæ puer*.

4, 3, 1 *eximiæ formæ virginem*.

5, 1, 7 *puer eximiæ formæ liberalis habitus*.

9, 2 Ext. 5 *filium liberalis formæ optimæque spei puerum*.

Sen. Dial. 6, 24, 3 *adulescens rarissimæ formæ*.

Curt. Ruf. 3, 12, 21 *reginas excellentis formæ*.

9, 13, 19 *cubilia amplioris formæ*.

Petron. 64 7 *ingentis formæ canis*.

Stat. Silv. 3, 4, 26 *puerum egregiæ formæ*

Tac. Ann. 4, 3 *formæ indecoræ*.

Suet. Dom. 10 *lanceas novæ formæ*.

Justin. 15, 4, 17 *leo ingentis formæ*.

18, 4, 3 *insignis formæ virgine*.

Apul. Met. 2, 5 *speciosæ formæ iuvenem*.

3, 15 *scitulæ formulæ iuvenem*.

Prob. Val. vita Pers. *formæ pulchræ*.

We are forced to the conclusion that the absence of a Genitive of Quality *faciei* is not due to reasons which would apply also to *forma*. It may be due to one reason which does not apply to *forma*; that is, to the etymological form of the word. The truth of this conclusion may be tested by an examination of the noun *species* in

this construction. Species is closely related in meaning to both forma and facies. Like both, it is freely used in the Ablative of Quality in early Latin. But it differs in form from forma and agrees in form with facies, and accordingly, if our conclusion for facies is true, species also will be used in the Ablative but not in the Genitive of Quality.

The instances for species follow:

Plaut.	Bacch.	838 bellan' videtur specie mulier.
	Pers.	546 specie liberalist.
	Poen.	1113 specie venusta, ore atque oculis pernigris.
	Rud.	415 specie lepida mulierem.
Cæs.	B. G.	6, 28, 1 (uri) sunt specie et colore et figura tauri.
Cic.	Rosc. Am.	63 aliquem humana specie et figura.
	Verr.	4, 129 eadem specie ac forma signum.
	Acad.	2, 66 latiore specie.
	Nat. Deor.	1, 26 æs pulcherrima specie.
		1, 48 hominis (= humana) specie deos.
	De divin.	2, 50 is Tages puerili specie.
		2, 63 "vidimus immani specie tortuque draconum terribilem" (a quoted hexameter).
	Lael.	47 (securitas) specie quidem blanda.
Liv.		1, 11, 8 aureas armillas magni ponderis. . . gemmatosque magna specie anulos.
		1, 45, 4 bos miranda magnitudine ac specie.
		1, 7, 4 boves mira specie.
		10, 39, 11 vana specie.
		21, 22, 6 iuvenem divina specie.
		40, 29 libros . . . recentissima specie.
Curt. Ruf.,		6, 523 specie singulari spado.
Plin.	N. H.,	2, 90 specieque humana dei   humanæ faciei Detlefsen  .

		2, 91 Typhon ignea specie.
		2, 93 Tibiarum specie.
		2, 90 hirti villorum specie.
		9, 144 specie vermiculorum.
		10, 8 vulturina specie.
		10, 114 hirundinum specie.
		10, 135 turdorum specie.
		11, 75 Salis specie.
		12, 39 Albæ violæ specie.
		13, 114 specie farris.
		21, 41 versicolori specie.
		24, 178 hederacia specie.
		25, 26 specie illa Homérica.
		25, 78 specie thyrsi.
		25, 167 trixaginis specie.
		27, 139 peltarum specie.
		30, 2 specie salutari.
		33, 144 Delicia specie.
		34, 116 vermiculorum specie.
		36, 20 velata specie.
		37, 54 blandissima specie.
		37, 144 crystallina specie.
		37, 149 vitrea specie.
		37, 176 globosa specie.
Tac.	Hist.	2, 50, 8 invisitata specie.
		4, 3, 8 ea prima specie forma.
		4, 83, 5 maiore quam humana specie.
		5, 6, 13 lacus inmenso ambitu specie maris.
		5, 11, 18 turres . . . mira specie.
		25, 5 classis egregia specie.
		30 specie canitieque pulchra.
Suet. Gell.	Agric. Claud.	13, 30 (29) 6 Quotes Plaut. Pœn. 1113 specie venusta.
		14, 2, 12, specie tenui parvaque.
		4, 83 gratissima specie.
		11, 241 multiformi specie.
Apul.	Met.	11, 244 catamiti pastoris specie.

Like *facie*, *specie* has only the ablative until as late as Palladius, who furnishes at last a single genitive.

Pall. 3, 9, 3 *pulchræ speciei*, *grani callosi et siccioris* . . . et *cutis tenerioris*.

This comes too late to hinder the conclusion that good stylists avoided *faciei* and *speciei* because of their form.

Other nouns of the fifth declension aid little in illustrating this influence of etymological form.

*Effigies* and *canities* are too rare, though always in the ablative.

Plin. N. H., 9, 54, *scorpionis effigie aranei magnitudinis*.

Tac. Hist., 2, 3, 11, *Simulacrum deæ non effigie humana*.

Suet. Claud., 30, *specie canitieque pulchra*.

*Rei* is exceptional, since it appears only in the Genitive in the phrases *nullius rei*, *nulli rei*, *non bonæ rei*, which are of very ancient use, and are ascribed by Bell to a locative origin. Plaut. Stich., 720; Cato. orig., frg. 141; Gell. XIV, 2, 6; IX, 2, 6.

In the case of *spes* and *fides* there is a special reason why the objection to the genitive form in *-ei* did not preclude its use. Take first *spes*. The early writers and Cicero used only the Ablative.

Plaut. Rud. 275 *quæ in locis nesciis nescia spe sumus*.

Cic. Att. 6, 1, 23 *De Egnatii Sidicine nomine nec nulla nec magna spe sumus*.

Fam. 1, 7, 11 *eximia spe summa virtute adulescentem*  
||*summæ virtutis* G. R. M<sup>r</sup>||

Fam. 12, 28, 3 *Ego sum spe bona*.

De Fin. 5, 52 *homines infima fortuna nulla spe rerum gerendarum*.

Sometimes later writers also use the Ablative:

Liv. 7, 7, 7 *primo stetit ambigua spe pugna*.

7, 27, 7 *et ne in muris quidem satis firma spe . . . sese dedidere*

26, 37, 3 *suspensa omnia utrisque erant integra spe, integro metu*.

Tac. Ann. 1, 31, 2 *legiones . . . magna spe fore ut*.

16, 3, 1 *luxuria inana spe*

Hist. 1, 12, 10 *multi stulta spe*.

Gell. 13, 5, 1 *spe vitæ tenui fuit*.

Now observe that regularly the *spes* expressed with this ablative is the hope which the subject feels; not the hope which the subject awakens. The second of these meanings (which Harper's Dictionary wrongly confines to the poets and post Augustan prose writers), is objectively distinct from the first, and it is in recognition of this distinction that Cæsar began to express the second meaning with the Genitive of Quality:

Cæs. B. G. 7, 63, 9 *inviti summæ spei adulescentes Eporedorix et Viridomarus Vercingetori parent*. (These are not youths who felt very great hope: but youths of very great promise.)



B. C. 3, 16, 3 ne res maximæ spei maximæque utilitatis eius iracundiâ impedirentur.

Hirtius B. G. 8, 8, 2 Singularis enim virtutis veterrimas legiones VII, VIII, IX, habebat, summæ spei delectæque juventutis XI.

Matius writing to Cic. 44 B. C. perceives the same distinction.

Cic. Fam. 11, 28, 6 et optimæ spei adolescenti.

Of course, the Silver writers use the genitive form:

Val. Max 9, 2, ext. 5 liberalis formæ, optimæque spei puerum.

Sen. Cont. 1, 6, 1 bonæ spei uxor, bonæ spei nurus

1, 6, exc. 6 Bonæ spei uxor, bonæ spei nurus.

Sen. Dial. 4. 24, 3 adulescens rarissimæ formæ in tam magna feminarum turba viros corrumpentium nullius se spei præbuit.

And thus we come to

Petron. 117 iuvenem ingentis eloquentiæ et spei.

and Plin. N. H. 18, 283 nec patitur ratio naturæ quicquam in satis ante diem spei esse certæ.

31, 48 promittit . . . optimas speique certissimæ.

Thus the Ablative expresses the literal idea of the quality, while for the derived idea the genitive seems needed; and because of this need the formal objection to a fifth declension genitive has been overlooked.

*Fides* shows a similar distinction in meanings. From the literal fides, "trust," which the subject feels, there is derived a fides, "trustworthiness," which the subject inspires, and if fides follows the analogy of *spes* we shall expect to find a genitive *fidei* appearing, after Cicero, to express this derived idea of trustworthiness. This expectation is met by the instances.

The early writers and Cicero used the Ablative, and the Ablative only.

Plaut. Aul. 213 Quid fide? E.-Bona.

Bacc. 542 Lingua factiosi, . . . sublesta fide.

Ter. Adel. 161 ut usquam fuit fide quisquam optuma.

442 (civium) antiqua virtute ac fide.

Cic. Fam. 1, 7, 2; singulari fide.

And likewise Fam. 13, 21, 2; 15, 4, 5; Sull. 58; de Rep. 3, 27.

Fam. 1, 7, 2 qua fide; and likewise Fam. 3, 9, 1; Flacc. 89; Clu. 47.

Sest. 20 incredibili fide; and so Mil. 91.

- Sull. 42 Summa fide; and so de Rep. 3, 27.  
 Verr. 2, 2, 2, ea fide.  
 Font. 31 quali fide.  
 Font. 23 quanta fide.  
 Fam. 1, 5, 4 fide maiore.  
 Fam. 14, 11 ista fide.  
 Nep. Iph. 3, 2 bonus vero civis fideque magna.  
 Eum. 1, 5 fide cognita.  
 With Livy came in the Genitive.  
 Liv. 2, 21, 3 quia collega dubiæ fidei fuerit.  
 44, 35, 10 notæ et fidei iam sibi et prudentiæ homines.  
 Val. Max. 3, 8, Ext. 4 efficacis operæ forensis, fidei non latentis  
 Athenis Ephialtes.  
 Sen. Cont. 1 Præf. 3 memoria . . . solebat bonæ fidei esse.  
 Tac. Ann. 1, 41, 6 Treveros externæ fidei ||externam fidem  
 Nipp.||  
 Hist. 3, 5, 12 incorruptæ erga Vitellium fidei.  
 Justin. (Trogus) 4, 2, 5 spectatæ fidei servo.  
 8, 3, 1 melioris fidei adversus socios.  
 8, 5, 4 pactio eius fidei fuit cuius ante fuerat.  
 9, 8, 19 sollertiæ pater maioris, hic fidei.  
 11, 1, 6 fidei dubiæ et mentis infidæ.  
 Gell. 1, 7, 1 libro spectatæ fidei.  
 13, 31 (30), 6 librum veterem fidei spectatæ.  
 14, 2, 5 virum . . expertæ fidei.  
 18, 5, 11 ut non turbidæ fidei nec ambiguae, sed ut puræ  
 liquentisque esset.  
 18, 9, 6 Illic igitur ætatis et fidei magnæ libro credo.  
 Justin. Inst. 4, 1, 15 bonæ fidei emptori.

When we find only two instances of the Ablative fide = "trustworthiness" after Cicero, we may regard them as due to early influence, as obviously is the case with the second example.

- Tac. Ann. 12, 41 etiam libertorum si quis incorrupta fide, depellitur.  
 Gell. 12, 4, 1 Descriptum definitumque est a Quinto Ennio  
 . . qua fide amicum esse.

A third instance of the influence of Etymological form appears in the use of the adjective *par*, *paris*.

For some reason only the Ablative of this adjective appears; unless we accept with H. Peter (S. H. A. Lpz., 1884), the emendation of Salmasius and read, Capitol. Ver. 1 in simili ac paris maiestatis imperio, where the older editors following the codex Palatinus and the Bambergensis read *pari*. This single exception, occurring

so late, would be, if admitted, of slight importance to our consideration; for the avoidance of the genitive *paris* by good stylists would still remain clear from a citation of the instances.

Plaut.	Bacc.	1108	<i>pari fortuna, ætate ut sumus (sc. pari), utimur.</i>
Cic	Fam.	15, 4, 10	<i>pari scelere et audacia.</i>
	Clu.	107	<i>Heius, pari integritate et prudentia.</i>
		197	<i>Marucini pari dignitate.</i>
	Sull.	36	<i>eos pari calamitate esse.</i>
	Phil.	3, 25	<i>civis egregius, parique innocentia M. Vehilius.</i>
		7, 6	<i>non quin pari virtute et voluntate alii fuerint.</i>
		11, 19	<i>cum pari dignitate simus.</i>
	Tusc.	2, 37	<i>pari animo inexercitatum militem.</i>
	de Orat.	1, 95	<i>si quis pari fuerit ingenio.</i>
	Top.	71	<i>pari gloria debent esse.</i>
	de Rep.	6 (Gell. 1, 6, 16)	<i>cum causa pari collegæ essent non modo invidia pari non erant.</i>
Cæs.	B. G.	7, 39	<i>Viridomarus, pari ætate et gratia.</i>
	B. C.	1, 25	<i>alias pari magnitudine rates.</i>
Nep.	Lys.	4, 2	<i>alterum librum pari magnitudine.</i>
	Dat.	2, 1	<i>pari se virtute præbuit.</i>
		3, 5	<i>pari imperio esse.</i>
	Hann.	7, 5	<i>pari diligentia se præbuit.</i>
		5, 3	<i>pari ac dictatorem imperio.</i>
	Att.	19, 2	<i>principes dignitate pari.</i>
Catull.		28, 11	<i>pari fuistis casu.</i>
Prop.		3, 9, 38 (4, 8, 38)	<i>prelia clade pari.</i>
Liv.		3, 51, 9	<i>pari potestate.</i>
		3, 70, 1	<i>cum consules essent pari potestate.</i>
		23, 26, 11	<i>velocitate pari, robore animi præstanti.</i>
		26, 49, 13	<i>nobilitate pari.</i>
		37, 40, 8	<i>pari numero Cretenses.</i>
Tac.	Hist.	1, 15	<i>frater pari nobilitate.</i>
		2, 64	<i>pari probitate mater.</i>
		3, 49	<i>pari innocentia agebat.</i>
	Ann.	1, 13	<i>promptum, artibus egregiis et pari fama.</i>
		2, 60	<i>qui pari virtute fuerint.</i>
		6, 20	<i>pari habitu.</i>
		13, 8	<i>effigiem pari magnitudine.</i>
		15, 32	<i>spectacula pari magnificentia.</i>
		15, 56	<i>Scævinius pari inbecillitate.</i>

Suet. Cal.	8 infans nomine pari.
Gell.	5, 8, 9 (tuba et lituus) pari forma.
	17, 9, 7 surculi pari crassamento eiusdemque longitudinis.

Observe that in the last example Gellius would have been kept from a symmetrical use of two Genitives of Quality, had he desired such symmetry, by the lack of a genitive paris.

If we add here the instances of *dispar* we shall have still a clear record of only the Ablative.

Liv. 33, 3.	10 Gortynii haut dispari armatu.
Tac. Hist. 4,	68 dispari animo.
Ann. 6 (5),	10 iuvenis haut dispari ætate.

The genitive *paris* is very frequent in the Arithmetic of Bœtius, for instance, 1, 5 *paris numeri definitio*, but this is in the 6th century, so late that for our construction it can have no significance.

When we come to inquire the reason for this exclusive use of *pari* we hit at once upon the suggestion that it may be due, as in the case of *facie* and *specie*, to a peculiarity of etymological form. The genitive form *paris*, not to mention its orthographical identity with the name of the hero Paris and the second person singular indicative of *pario*, coincides in form with the feminine nom. sing. *paris* and the acc. plural *paris* (cf. Neue) and for this reason it may have been avoided.

A different reason is implied in Lane's remark (Gram., § 1240) "A substantive expressing quality with *æquus*, *par*, *similis*, or *dis-similis* in agreement, is put, not in the genitive, but in the ablative, by Cicero, Cæsar, Nepos and Livy."

These adjectives have at bottom a common idea, and our inference is that on account of this idea they are not adapted for use in the Genitive of Quality and hence do not appear. Such a view is not of itself unreasonable and is supported by the circumstance that, not only in the authors named, but in all the literature, so far as the present collection of instances covers, no example of any of those adjectives in the Genitive has been found; excepting only *similis*, which occurs in Palladius. On the other hand, the force of this inference is weakened by the fact that all the adjectives named are of the same termination in the Genitive except *æquus*, whose occurrence is in good Latin exceedingly rare, Plaut. having three times *æquo*

animo adeste; Cicero, æquo animo once. *Æquus* is frequent in ecclesiastical Latin = *bono animo*, and occurs twice in Pseudo Polemo Foerst. 154 and 155 *æqua* [media] *magnitudine*, but this does not affect our argument. Perhaps we should have drawn a different inference from Lane's remark about *æquus*, *par*, *similis*, if he had added, what seems to be equally true, that other adjectives not put in the Genitive of Quality are *muliebris*, *incredibilis*, *horribilis*, *terribilis*, *trucis*, *fidelis*, *comis*, *lenis*, *incolumis*, *qualis* and some others in *-is*. Surely with this list before us the suggestion aroused by the case of *par* will return with renewed force. All these adjectives in *-is*, *-is*, *-e* have a common form for gen. sing., acc. pl., fem. nom. sing. and masc. nom. sing. as well, and if the genitive *paris* has been avoided through the uncertainty of its form, then every genitive of an adjective in *-is* will be avoided, and none will appear except for a special reason.

The great number of such adjectives in use gives an opportunity to test on a large scale the truth of our supposition.

It is significant, therefore, when in Cæsar and Cicero over against more than 130 examples of adjectives in *-is* in the Ablative of Quality, only five appear in the Genitive and each for a special reason. Nor is this significance removed by the fact that the Ablatives are in general four times as frequent as the Genitives in Cæsar and Cicero.

With the writers of Silver Latin the general proportion of Ablatives and Genitives changed, some writers having as many as 13 Genitives to one Ablative. Yet out of all the 620 Genitives of Quality in Silver Latin, only 19 have adjectives in *-is*. Since of the Ablatives of Quality one out of every five has its adjective in *-is*, it is manifest that for some reason the Genitives in *-is* have failed to appear in their due proportion.

It remains to show the exceptional character of those Genitives in *-is* which do appear. First, we may take the adjective *singularis*, which occurs in the Ablative no less than 24 times in Cicero alone; for the orations and philosophical works see Merguet; the instances from the letters are:

- |      |         |   |
|------|---------|---|
| Fam. | 1, 7,   | 2 L, <i>Racilius et fide et animo singulari.</i>        |
|      | 5, 5,   | 2 <i>animus quam singulari officio fuerit</i>           |
|      | 6, 7,   | 1 <i>singulari sum fato</i>                             |
|      | 10,     | 29 <i>sunt singulari in te benevolentia</i>             |
|      | 13, 21, | 2 <i>est in patronum suum officio et fide singulari</i> |

- 15, 4, 5 *vir cum benevolentia et fide erga populum Romanum singulari tum præsentia, magnitudine et animi et consilii*

In spite of the frequency of this adjective Cicero used *singularis* in the Genitive but once (in a passage which Merguet overlooks);

Pro Sulla 34 *maximi animi summi consilii singularis constantiæ*, and there manifestly to accord with the other Genitives *animi* and *consilii*, which Cicero was accustomed to use together, thus:

- Muren. 34 *fortissimi animi summi consilii*  
 Fam. 3, 10, 7 *Magni animi non minimi consilii*  
 Fam. 10, 19, 1 *fortissimi animi summique consilii*  
 Font. 41 *summi consilii et maximi animi*

Cæsar uses no instance of the Genitive of Quality, but Hirtius in the 8th book *Bell. Gall.* uses it twice,

- B. G. 8, 8, 2 *singularis enim virtutis veterrimas legiones . . . habebat.*

- 8, 28, 2 *Quintus Atius Varus, præfectus equitum, singularis et animi et prudentiæ vir.*

In the first of these instances the contradiction of Cæsar's own usage (cf. *Bell. Civ.* 3, 59, *erant singulari virtute homines*, and *Bell. Civ.* 3, 91 *Crastinus, vir singulari virtute*) is perhaps due to the feeling that with the verb *habebat* the ablative would be felt to limit that verb as an Ablative of Manner, which the author did not intend.

In the second instance, the difference in meaning between the Genitive *animi* and the Ablative *animo*, which was so strongly marked in the writers preceding Hirtius, may have influenced the choice of this genitive form of expression. With *animi* determined, the use of *singularis* is not so strange for a writer who had already used it once, and who seems not to have felt the objection to its use so clearly as did his contemporaries.

A similar adjective is *insignis*. The usage of classical and Silver Latin was limited to the Ablative of Quality.

- Cic. Att. 1, 12, 3 *rem esse insigni infamia.*  
 Liv. 29, 19, 8 *puerum forma insigni.*  
 Tac. Hist. 4, 15 *Brinno, claritate natalium insigni.*  
 Ann. 1, 41 *ipsa insigni fecunditate, præclara pudicitia.*  
 2, 73 *utrumque corpore decoro, genere insigni.*

- 6, 31 Sinnaces, insigni familia ac perinde opibus.  
 11, 36 is modesta iuventa, corpore insigni.  
 12, 56 ipse insigni paludamento.

The genitive was introduced by Justinus, a circumstance which has been overlooked by J. Benesch, in his treatise "De casuum obliquorum apud Justinum, &c." (Vienna, 1889) one section of which (p. 36 ff.) he has devoted to the Genitive of Quality without observing any instance of insignis.

- Justin.      2, 7, 4 Solon, vir iustitiæ insignis.  
                  18, 4, 3 insignis formæ virgine.  
                  24, 8, 5 iuvenem insignis pulchritudinis.  
                  41, 5, 10 insignis virtutis viro.

In the same way some 80 adjectives might be mentioned, each appearing with greater or less frequency in the Ablative of Quality; but occurring in the Genitive of Quality rarely or only for special cause. Large as is the number of instances collected for this investigation, it is not of sufficient completeness to warrant the statement that any given Genitive never occurs. We must be content with asserting that no such Genitive has come to light in the course of the investigation.

Thus we can say of *incredibilis* only that its Genitive is not at hand, whereas the Ablative is frequent:

For instance, of a dozen examples in Cicero take

- Cic.      Phil. 3, 3, *adulescens incredibili virtute*;  
             from Cæsar; B. G. 1, 39 *qui ingenti magnitudine corporum  
    germanos incredibili virtute . . .  
    esse prædicabant.*  
             from Vell.              2, 99 *Tiberius, ducum maximus mira et  
    incredibili atque inenarrabili pie-  
    tate.*

A list of other such adjectives has been given at page 30, to which may be added, *difficilis*, *dulcis*, *ferialis*, *grandis*, *hilaris*, *incolumis*, *inenarrabilis*, *innumerabilis*, *mirabilis*, *mortalis*, *nobilis*, *notabilis*, *pastoralis*, *pedalis*, *perennis*, *pinguis*, *probabilis*, *puerilis*, *regalis*, *senilis*, *stabilis*, *talis*, *tolerabilis*, *triumphalis*, *virginalis*, *semicubitalis*, *quincuncialis*, etc.

*Mediocris* occurs once in the Genitive and that as early as Cicero. De Orat. 1, 257 *et illa orationis suæ cum scriptis alienis comparatio . . . non mediocris contentionis est vel ad memoriam vel ad imitandum.*

If we try to substitute here the Ablative, we shall observe how wide the Ablative would have come from expressing the intended idea.

The use of the Ablative is shown in

- Cic. Brut. 237 Murena mediocri ingenio, sed magno studio rerum veterum.  
 Cæs. B. C. 3, 36, 1 mediocri latitudine fossam.  
 Tac. Ann. 4, 11, quis mediocri prudentia nedum tantis rebus exercitus.

The eager disposition of the Silver writers to forsake the Ablative of Quality and employ the Genitive has sometimes overcome the tendency to avoid the Genitives in -is, as is illustrated in the case of *immanis*, whose use by Velleius 1, 12, 4 *immanis magnitudinis hostem*, stands in contrast with the earlier examples.

- Lucr. 5, 33 *immani corpore Serpens*.  
 Verg. Æn. 3, 427 *immani corpore pistris*.  
 5, 372 *Buten, immani corpore*.  
 Cæs. B. G. 4, 1 *immani corporum magnitudine homines*  
 Cic. Top. 44 *immani acerbaque natura*.  
 de Div. 2, 63 *vidimus immani specie tortuque draconem*.

For another illustration of this same inclination we may take *liberalis*, which appears always in the Ablative in Plautus and Terence.

- Pl. Epid. 43 *forma lepida ac liberali captivam*.  
 Mil. 967 *lepida ac liberali formast*.  
 Persa 130 *forma lepida ac liberali est*.  
 546 *specie . . . liberalist*.  
 Ter. Andr. 123 *erat forma . . . liberali*.  
 Eun. 473 *Quam liberali facie*.  
 682 *Honesta facie et liberali*.  
 Hec. 164 *liberali esse ingenio*.

but with Valerius Maximus comes the Genitive.

- Val. Max. 5, 1, 7 *puer eximiæ formæ et liberalis habitus*.  
 9, 2, Ext. 15 *liberalis formæ, optimæ spei puerum*.

A different influence which has operated to overcome this disinclination to use Genitives in -is is to be seen in the case of the adjective *fortis*, which appears regularly in the Ablative; for instance, Cic. *Sest.* 1; *Brut.* 330; *Fin.* 3, 29; Verg. 4, 11. When we find in Gell. 11, 13, 10 in *tam fortis facundiæ viro*, it requires but a glance to see that here an ablative *forti facundia* would have been



confusing to the construction after the preposition *in*. To avoid this confusion the author might have had recourse either to an adjective, such as *facundioso*, or to the Genitive of Quality, and the latter he did employ. *Tenuis* is perhaps a Genitive of Quality in

Gell. 2, 6, 2 *vexasse putant verbum esse leve et tenuis ac parvi incommodi.*

but elsewhere it appears only in the Ablative:

Ter. Phorm. pl. 5 *fabulas tenui esse oratione et scriptura levi.*

Cic. Cato Maj. 35 *quam tenui valetudine Africani filius!*

Sen. Contr. 1, 1, 8 *summissa et tenui voce.*

Plin. N. H. 25, 68 *centaurium minutis foliis, radice tenui.*

25, 124 *caule simplici et tenui.*

27, 76 *radice tenui, nigra.*

One more adjective may be mentioned; *tristis*.

The Ablative is witnessed by

Plaut. Asin. 401, *tristi fronte.*

Cic. Quint 59 *natura tristi ac recondita fuit.*

Sen. Cont. 2, 4, 3 *tristi vultu.*

Tac. Ann. 14, 16 *tristi vultu.*

The Genitive, on the other hand, is found only in Seneca Rhetor, twice in Müller's text, in the same section.

Sen. Cont. 1, 3, 3 "*Erat*" inquit "*præruptus locus et immensæ altitudinis tristis aspectus.*"

And again 1, 3, 3 [*et immensæ altitudinis tristis aspectus*]  
electus is potissimum locus ut damnati  
sæpius deiciantur.

In the first of these passages the MSS. do not have the words *tristis aspectus*, which the editor inserts, following the conjecture of Konitzer.

In the second passage, however, where the MSS. do have the phrase "*et . . . aspectus*," Konitzer regards the whole phrase as an interpolation and it is bracketed accordingly. So then we have authority for but one *tristis*, and that either in a questionable passage, following the MSS. reading, or in a conjectured reading, following the editor's.

But since this is the only instance of the Genitive *tristis* at hand from any author; since, moreover, Seneca elsewhere uses the Ablative *tristi*, and, finally, since out of the 88 examples of the Geni-

tive of Quality used by Seneca this doubtful or conjectural *tristis* is the only one containing an adjective in *-is*, it would seem as if Konitzer might have done better if after striking out the doubtful *tristis aspectus* he had not inserted it in the other place.

In the fifth place among the influences upon usage which arise from etymological form we may consider the avoidance of the rhymes *-orum, -orum; -arum, -arum*. It is already well known that this influence has operated in some other constructions, for instance, in Livy, in determining the choice between the gerund and gerundive constructions; thus, compare *consilium oppuquandi Syracusas* with *consilium oppugnandarum Syracusarum*; but that it has operated to restrict the use of the Genitive of Quality has been overlooked hitherto.

In early Latin the use of the Genitive of Quality, whether forming a rhyme or not, is so rare that we have no ground for attributing the use of the Ablative *summis ditiis* in Plaut. Capt. 170 and Poen. 60 to an inclination to avoid the rhyme of *summorum ditiarum*; nor should we so attribute Pseud. 1218 *crassis suris* or Pseud. 852 *aquilinis ungulis*. But in the classical and Silver writers the genitive plural is also so rare that Kuhner, Lat. Gram., § 86, 4, can comment to Cic Fam. 4, 8, 1, and Rosc. Am. 6, 17 "sonst aber vermeidet die Lateinische Sprache von körperlichen oder geistigen Eigenschaften den Gen. des Plurals." If the Genitive plurals are truly so rare whether rhyming or not, then we should be left with no other inference than that the writers avoided the Genitive plural; but we have to cite a considerable number of instances of the Genitive of Quality in the plural where the endings form no rhyme. Thus :

Plaut.	Aul.	325	trium litterarum homo.
Cic.	Brut.	286	multarum orationum.
		246	multarumque causarum.

Here, observe, the rhyme is broken by the change of accent caused by the insertion of *que*.

	Orat.	85	valentiorum laterum.
	Tusc. 5, 1, 2		tantarum virium.
	de Petit.	9	nullarum partium.
	Att.	13, 29	multarum nuptium:
Sall.	Jug.	85, 10	multarum imaginum.
Liv.		28, 20	levium corporum.
		44, 4	gravium armorum.

And Livy has many examples involving the noun-forms *annorum*, *navium*, *gentium*, *ætatum*, *ordinum*, *generum* and *amphorarum*, of which those that could form a rhyme -orum, -orum, or -arum, -arum are used only with numbers, which, of course, do not have those genitive forms; as, for instance, *novem annorum*. *Duorum annorum* does not seem to occur.

Vell.		2, 93	ingenuarum virtutum.
Tac.	Ann.	4, 31	eluctantium verborum.
Firm. Mat.		3, 5, 15	tantarum facultatum.
Hieron.	Ep.	117, 6	furvarum vestium.
		117, 8	vestium sericarum.

It is not to be maintained that these rhymes were for every construction totally avoided. Landgraf's citation of *Rosc. Am.* 103; *Verr.* 4, 126; 5, 121; *Mil.* 64; *Cat.* 1, 7; *Cat.* 4, 20; *Mur.* 21, from Cicero alone, will show that they now and then occur. Even in the Genitive of Quality we have from Cicero two instances; *Orator*, 169, *paucorum colorum*, and *Nat. Deor.* 2, 48 *aliarum formarum*; but these are exceptional.

The commonest expressions in which these rhymes appear in the Genitive of Quality are those which seem to be translations of Greek adjectives compounded with *πόλυ*. Here the Genitive, both in singular and plural, is far more frequent than the Ablative. This coincidence is remarked by Landgraf (*Sex. Rosc.*, p. 163), who cites instances from Cicero and Horace.

Cic.	Rosc. Am.	17	plurimarum palmarum gladiator	(cf. πολυστεφής)
	Att.	13, 29, 1	Cornificia vetula sane et multarum nuptiarum	(cf. πολύγαμος.)
Hor.	Od.	3, 9, 7	multi Lydia nominis	(cf. πολυώνυμος.)

Other instances of such Genitives are in the singular ;

Plaut.	Vid. Frg.	(148-9)	cibi minimi.
Varro,	R. R.	2, 11	non maximi, minimi cibi.
Cic.	Fam.	9, 26, 4	non multi cibi hospitem accipies
Sueton.	Galb.	22	cibi plurimi.

Fronto.		35 multi cibi.	(With all of which compare <i>πολυφάγος, πολύσιτος.</i> )
Hor.	Sat.	1, 1, 33 magni formica laboris	(cf. <i>πολύμοχθος.</i> )
Cic.	de Orat.	1, 257 multi sudoris.	
	Fam.	2, 13, 1 multi consili	(cf. <i>πολυπραδής.</i> )
		3. 6, 3 magnæ deliberationis.	(cf. <i>πολύφροντις.</i> )
	Q. F.	2, 9, 3 multæ artis.	
Fronto.		93 [N] multi somni.	
Plaut.	Bacc.	770 magnæ dividia.	

And in the plural ;

Cic.	de Leg. Agr.	2, 36 via Herculanea multarum deliciarum et magnæ pecuniæ.
Fronto.	ad Am.	2, 11 multorum ramorum.
Apul.	Met.	10, 25 multarum palmarum spectatus præliis.

Aside from Genitives of Quality of this particular class, the instances are very rare in the writings of good stylists. If, now, the later writers ceased to be sensitive to such distinctions and employed the rhyme where previously it had been avoided, there will be no occasion for surprise. Thus Firmicus Maternus could write, *Math.*, 3, 7, 6 magnæ mentis, magnorum ac divinorum consiliorum viros ; and Polemo (Foerst, p. 182) could write *asinus deterriorum morum*, *crocodilus deterriorum morum* ; *Balæna morum deterriorum* ; *Testudo morum deterriorum* & (p. 184) *Anguilla morum deterriorum* ; *Rana deterriorum morum*, &c.

From the use of this last noun, *mos*, *moris*, *morum*, the argument before us can be well illustrated. *Mos* is a noun, the idea of which it seemed good to Latin writers to express in the Genitive, without exception in the singular. Thus :

Liv.	39, 11 probam et antiqui moris feminam.
Vell.	2, 116, 3 vir antiquissimi moris
Tac. Hist.	1, 14 Piso. . moris antiqui.
	2, 64 mater antiqui moris.
Ann.	1, 35 sævum id malique moris.
	16, 5 severaque adhuc et antiqui moris.
Justin.	14, 2, 4 vestis olim sui moris,

When, now, in the plural we find

Plautus, Capt.	105	antiquis est adulescens moribus.
Most.	708	ut moribus sient (= quibus moribus, Ebr.)
Stich.	105	quibus matronas moribus.
Trin.	284	sæculum moribus quibus siet.
	825	omnes . . avidis moribus.
Truc. Arg.	5	vi magna servos est ac trucibus.
Ter. Andr.	395	uxorem his moribus.
Cic. Quinct.	59	omnis his moribus.
Verr. 3,	62	moribus eisdem.
Flacc.	26	unis moribus vivere.

we may be reminded of the principle which Kühner observed in connection with Cic. Tusc. 5, 1, 2 (Gram., § 86, 4) where he says the different case “darf nicht auffallen, da der sing. dieses Wortes eine andere Bedeutung hat.” But, aside from such a reason for the appearance of the ablatives here we should attribute them to the overwhelming preference of the earlier writers for the Ablative of Quality. It is when we come to Velleius, who used almost no Ablatives of Quality, but the Genitive, and who has in the singular *moris* (cf. above), that we are struck with the use of 2, 91, 2 *diversis moribus*, and not *diversorum morum*. And then Tacitus, who wrote four times the genitive singular, has, Ann. 17, 19, 3 *hominem . . corruptis moribus*, and not *corruptorum morum*. And Aurelius Victor broke the symmetry of his construction to say, Caes, 18 *doctrinæ omnis ac moribus antiquissimis*, instead of *morum antiquissimorum*. The Ablative appears also in

Sall. Jug.	4, 7	his moribus.
Gell.	3, 16, 12	feminam bonis atque honestis moribus.
	17, 19, 3	hominem corruptis moribus.
Firm. Mat.	3, 2, 20	honestis moribus.
	3, 3, 10	honestis moribus.
	3, 7, 8	divinis moribus.
	3, 10, 9	bonis consiliis ac moribus.

When, now, we find in the fourth century Polemo with his “*morum pravorum*” (Foerst, p. 17, 4, 8) and his “*difficiliorum morum*” (p. 246, 17) we may attribute the difference in usage, not to a difference in the ideas to be expressed by the Ablative plural and the Genitive plural, but to a lack in Polemo of that taste which led the earlier writers to avoid the rhyme -orum, -orum.

Sixth to be considered of the influences of form upon usage is that arising from the limitations of meter, and in particular, of the hexameter. This is an influence which will be felt, not alone in the language of the writers of hexameter, but in that also of the Silver prose writers, who, as we know, often adopted the phrases of the Epic poets with out stopping to consider whether the use of these phrases had been affected by considerations due purely to the limitations of verse.

If we take a glance at Enn. Ann. 266 (Müller) . . . *longi cupressi Stant rectis foliis et amaro corpore buxum*, we see that a genitive corporis was not available for the fifth foot of this hexameter. If we observe Lucretius, we find the following array of Ablatives:

- 1, 232 *mortali corpore quæ sunt.*
- 1, 242 *Ubi, nulla forent æterno corpore, quorum.*
- 1, 246 *Incolumi remanent res corpore, dum satis acris.*
- 1, 297 . . . *aperto corpore qui sunt.*
- 1, 488 . . . *solido reperiri corpore posse.*
- 3, 177 . . . *quali sit corpore et unde.*
- 5, 33 . . . *immani corpore serpens.*
- 5, 241 . . . *corpore nativo ac mortalibus esse figuris.*
- 5, 1302 . . . *boves lucas turrato corpore, tetras.*
- 6, 100 . . . *condenso corpore nubes.*
- 6, 361 . . . *tam denso corpore nubes.*
- 6, 936 . . . *quam raro corpore sint res.*
- 6, 1036 . . . *raro sunt corpore, et ær.*

Nearly every instance has the Ablative in the fifth foot, where the Genitive, for metrical reasons, would be unavailable.

Observe next Vergil's *Æneid*:

- 1, 71 *Præstanti corpore nymphæ.*
- 3, 427 *immani corpore pistrix.*
- 5, 372 *Buten immani corpore, qui se.*
- 7, 783 *præstanti corpore Turnus.*
- 8, 207 *præstanti corpore tauros.*
- 8, 330 *immani corpore Thybris.*
- 8, 711 *magno mærentem corpore Nilum.*
- 9, 563 *candenti corpore cycnum.*
- 9, 722 *fuso germanum corpore vidit.*
- 10, 345 *fidens primævo corpore clausus.*

And the *Georgics*:

- 4, 539 *præstanti corpore tauros.*
- 4, 550 *præstanti corpore tauros.*

Over and over again the Ablative in the fifth foot of the hexameter.

Now, if Roman schoolboys learned Vergil by heart, what limit shall we set to the influence of Vergil's phrases upon later usage, determined though those phrases may have been for Vergil by purely metrical considerations? The general usage did follow the form fixed by the hexameter. How completely let the following instances witness:

Plaut. Capt.	647	macilento ore, naso acuto, corpore albo, oculis nigris;
Poen.	1112	statura hau magna, corpore aquilost.
Cic. Cæc.	27	Cæsenius non tam auctoritate gravi quam corpore.
Leg. Agr.	2, 13	vestitu obsoletiore, corpore inculto et horrido.
ad Quir.	4	qui numquam ægro corpore fuerunt.
Fam. 11, 27, 1		nondum satis firmo corpore cum esset.
Nat. Deor. 2, 59		iis corporibus sunt ut.
Nepos Ages.	8, 1	statura fuit humili et corpore exiguo.
Ovid Am. 2, 10, 28		forti corpore inani fui.
Ovid Met. 3, 44		tantoque est corpore quanto.
Liv. 7, 12, 11		ad hoc iis corporibus.
	24, 26, 13	tot armatos aliquotiens integro corpore evaserunt.
Plin. N. H. 7, 24		choromandræ stridoris horrendi, hirtis corporibus, oculis glaucis.
	7, 81	corpore vesco sed eximiis viribus Tritanum.
	8, 174	duritia eximia pedum strigoso corpore.
Tac. Hist. 2, 32		Germanos fluxis corporibus.
	4, 46	producuntur intecto corpore.
	4, 77	intecto corpore, promptus inter tela.
Ann. 2, 73		corpore decoro, genere insigni.
	2, 75	Agrippina corpore ægro.
	4, 29	Tubero defecto corpore:
	6, 46	incertus animi, fesso corpore
	11, 36	is modesta iuventa, corpore insigni.
	14, 17	multi . . . trunco per vulnera corpore.
	15, 34	corpore detorto.
Suet. Aug. 80		corpore traditur maculoso.
Tib. 68		corpore fuit amplo atque robusto.
Calig. 50		fuit . . . corpore enormi.
Claud. 30		nam et prolixo nec exili corpore erat.

Nero	51	statura fuit prope iusta, corpore maculoso et fætido.
Galb.	3	quamquam brevi corpore.
Fronto ad M Cæs.	1, 2	valeat integro, inlibato, incolumi corpore.
ad Ant.	2, 6	salubri corpore, velox patiens laboris.
Gell.	3, 1, 11	corpore esse vegeto.
	5, 8, 5	(Verg. <i>Æn.</i> 5, 372) Buten immani corpore.
	9, 4, 10	corporibus hirtis.
	13, 5, 1	corpore ægro adfectoque ac spe vitæ tenui fuit.
	19, 7, 3	corpore, inquit, pectoreque undique obeso.
	19, 13, 3	<i>ναύους</i> vocaverunt brevi atque humili corpore homines.

And so on to the later writers.

In comparison with these Ablatives, corpore, the instances of the Genitives, corporis, are strikingly few. The first instance is

Nepos Dat.	3, 1	hominem maximi corporis terribilique facie,
------------	------	---

where the genitive corporis is used to make a distinction between the derived meaning "bodily size," and the common literal meaning "the body," which the Ablative so regularly expresses.

Next comes

Hor. Epist.	1, 20, 24	corporis exigui præcanum
-------------	-----------	--------------------------

where the ablative corpore would not have fitted the verse.

Then come the Silver writers, who, other things being equal, favored the Genitive. Even they show only a few instances:

Liv.	28, 20, 3	levium corporum homines
	41, 9, 5	puerum trunci corporis
Sen. Cont.	4, Exc. 2	sacerdos non integri corporis
Sen. Dial.	4, 35, 2	senex infirmi corporis est
Justinus Præf.	1	rem magni animi et corporis (? operis ?)

And so is the list exhausted until we come to the writers of the later time, such as Palladius, who, with a peculiarity of his own style, has

	3, 26, 1	vasti et ampli corporis, sed rotundi potius quam longi
--	----------	--



- 4, 11, 2 *solidi corporis*
- 4, 11, 5 *corporis longi*
- 4, 13, 4 *et magni ventris et corporis*
- 4, 14, 1 *magni corporis*
- 8, 4, 3 *vasti corporis et prolixi*
- 12, 13, 7 *magni corporis*
- 12, 13, 7 *similis corporis*

That such a marked preference for the ablative *corpore* is not without a cause we are entitled to assume; and a manifest cause is before us in the influence of the hexameter. Let us not fall, however, into the error of supposing that the influence of the hexameter must be the only cause which has operated. Cicero and Nepos cannot owe their Ablatives to the study of Vergil in school; and while we might attribute their ablatives to the hexameters of Lucretius and Ennius, if no other source were apparent, we should still be forced to recognize a different reason for Plautus' use of *corpore*; a reason which lies upon the surface in the early preponderance of all Ablatives of Quality over the Genitives, owing to the undeveloped stage of the genitive construction.

In some of the instances cited the Ablative will have its ground in still other causes; for instance, in Cic. Leg. Agr. 2, 13, a Genitive *corporis inculti et horridi* could scarcely have been applied to such a transitory quality as that which the author intended to describe.

So also Tac. Hist. 4, 46 (above) and many other phrases expressing transitory qualities; cf. those having adjectives *ægro*, *fesso*, *trunco*, *fluxis*, *intecto*, *defecto*, *valenti*, *adfecto*, etc.

In Nep. Ages. 8, 1 it is possible that *corpore exiguo* is put in the Ablative to balance the Ablative *statura humili*, which is foreordained by its adjective *humilis* to be in the Ablative, this adjective not appearing in the Genitive of Quality. This possibility is weakened by the fact that the only time we find the Genitive *corporis exigui*, Hor. Epist. 1, 20, 24, it is required by the meter.

In Plin. N. H. 7, 24 the Ablative, says Kühner (Gram. § 86, 4), is due to avoidance of the Genitive plural of bodily or mental qualities. He does not observe that the disuse of the Genitive plural may be due to avoidance of the rhyme *-orum*, *-orum*.

A further reason for the appearance of *corpore* regularly in the Ablative of Quality may be assumed in the close similarity between the idea of the body itself and the idea of the parts of the body.

Everybody wrote the bodily parts in the Ablative, and why not also corpore?

Whether any of the writers were conscious of imitating the Vergilian form when they wrote the Ablative corpore it is not for us to inquire. That the hexameter poets were free in its use and limited in their use of the Genitive by the requirements of their verse must be apparent.

This evidence of a metrical influence upon the use of corpore is sustained most clearly by the situation with regard to the use of ponderis, pondere. Pondus stands in no such relation to the parts of the body as does corpus. Neither is it an external nor a transient quality. Guided, accordingly, by the character of its idea, we should look for its occurrence in the Genitive rather than in the Ablative. Such was the usage of Cæsar, one of the most correct writers, who has, B. G. 2, 29, 3 magni ponderis saxa, and B. G. 7, 22, 5 maximi ponderis saxis, with never the Ablative pondere. Servius may have had some such idea when he explained Verg. *Æn.* 10, 381 magno pondere saxum, with the remark "hoc est; magni ponderis, ut 'ære cavo clipeum' (*Æn.* 3, 286) pro 'æris cavi;'" just as to *Æn.* 1, 71 he comments "præstanti autem corpore, pro præstantis corporis, ablativum pro genitivo." From Cicero Stegmann can quote but two exceptions to the rule that expressions of weight appear in the Genitive, and these both consist of the same phrase, Cic. *Verr.* 2, 4, 32 hydriam præclaro opere et grandi pondere and *Nat. Deor.* 3, 83 amiculum grandi pondere. To these may be added two more expressions of weight which Stegmann's observation did not include; Att. 10, 1, 1 filius eodem apud me pondere, quo ille fuit, and *Acad.* 2, 121 naturalibus fieri aut factum esse docet ponderibus et motibus. If we add these, still the number is so small that we may regard the Ablative for expressions of weight as exceptional. Cicero's use of the Genitive ponderis and its natural and logical employment in the pages of succeeding writers may be observed from the following instances, added to those mentioned from Cæsar above.

Cic.	Fam.	2, 19, 2 tuæ litteræ . . . maximi sunt apud me ponderis.
	Att.	14, 14, 1 litteras . . . tuas et magni quidem ponderis.

Vatin.		9 boni viri iudicent id est maximi momenti et ponderis.
Planc.		4 (merita Plancii) magni . . . ponderis apud vos esse debere.
Liv.		1, 11, 8 aureas armillas magni ponderis.
		3, 57, 7 coronam auream . . parvi ponderis.
		22, 32, 4 pateræ aureæ magni ponderis.
		22, 32, 9 patera quæ ponderis minimi.
		33, 36, 13 torques magni ponderis.
		37, 46, 3 vasa . . multa magni ponderis.
Val. Max.		1, 1, Ext. 3 magni ponderis aureo Amiculo.
		4, 1, Ext. 7 magni ponderis aurea mensa.
Curt. Ruf.		10, 1, 24 aurea magni ponderis vasa.
Plin.	N. H.	33, 107 ut sit modici ponderis.
		37, 24 mirandi ponderis (gemmam nasci).
Stat.	Silv.	1, 4, 7 cervix Ponderis immensi.
Fronto	Ad. M. Cæs.	1, 5 Eiusdem usus et ponderis.
Justin.		39, 2, 6 Iovis simulacrum infiniti ponderis.

Since we were awaiting such a predisposition for the Genitive *ponderis*, we shall be surprised now to find the literature furnishing more instances of the Ablative *pondere* than of *ponderis* itself. The surprise will vanish when we consider where the Ablatives occur. They are, in the first place,

Lucr.		4, 905 tympana pondere magno.
		5, 540 nullo sunt pondere membra.
		5, 558 quam magno pondere nobis.
		5, 975 magno pondere clavæ.
		6, 549 tecta. . non magno pondere tota.
		6, 692 mirando pondere saxa.
Next Verg. Æn.		5, 401 immani pondere cæstus.
		5, 447 ad terram pondere vasto Concidit.
		9, 512 saxa quoque infesto,olvebant pondere, — — —
		10, 381 magno vellit dum pondere saxum.
And here Stat. Theb.		5, 577 magno tellurem pondere mensus.

Everywhere the Ablative in the fifth foot of the hexameter! And mark, especially, the unavoidable *pondere saxum*, *saxa*, of Lucr. 6,

692 and Verg. 9, 512; 10, 381 in comparison with the more correct *magni ponderis saxa* of Cæsar, cited above. The ordinary distinction with regard to the usage in expressions of weight has given way before the requirements of the hexameter.

In Hor. Epod. 4, 18 *navium gravi pondere* (Peerlkamp: *ære navium gravi pondera*);

the Ablative is not required by the meter; but in the pentameter of Propertius,

1, 17, 24 *ut mihi non ullo pondere terra foret*;

the Genitive was metrically inadmissible.

Besides the instances already mentioned from the poets and Cicero, the following few appear in prose:

Curt. Ruf. 5, 2, 11 *L millia talentum argenti, non signati forma sed rudi pondere.*

Tac. Hist. 2, 22 *molares ingenti pondere.*

Ann. 2, 57 *coronæ aureæ magno pondere.*

16, 1 *magna vis auri, rudi et antiquo pondere.*

Gell. 5, 8, 5 (Verg. *Æn.* 3, 618) *immani pondere cæstus.*

Of these few it is interesting to observe that all except one have adjectives with the Genitive in -is, the exception being in Tacitus, who never uses the Genitive *ponderis*, and it contains the adjective *magno*, which was frequent in the hexameter.

Thus, the history of *ponderis* supports the argument that the limitations of hexameter have been a factor in determining the use of certain Ablatives of Quality.

## CHAPTER III.

---

If the Ablative is the "with" case and the Genitive the "of" case, then it is natural that we should feel the relation between an Ablative of Quality and a Genitive of Quality modifying the same noun to be substantially identical with that which subsists between the ideas of "with" and "of," the former relating the quality to its noun in the guise of something appearing with the noun, an attendant quality of circumstance; the latter in the guise of something belonging to the noun, its permanent or essential attribute. Grammarians have all, in a general way, shared this feeling, and if one has emphasized the permanency of an attributive, another its essentiality as the ground of its expression in the Genitive, neither has been, in practice, very wide of the truth, and, when in error, has been so, not because of a failure to perceive the logical difference between Ablative and Genitive, but because of certain circumstances attending the history of the development of the two constructions hitherto not sufficiently observed. If, from the beginning on, both expressions of quality had stood in the same stage of development as that in which they stand in the usage of Livy, it is likely that much of the apparent inconsistency in their use would have been avoided. Historically, such was not the case. In Plautus the Ablative alone is common; whether expressing so transitory a quality as a moment's good courage, *Amph.* 671 *Bono animo es*; a passing shade of bodily expression, *Asin.* 401 *tristi fronte, quassanti capite*, or so permanent and inalterable a quality as the shape of the nose, color of the eyes, *Capt.* 647 *macilento ore, naso acuto, corpore albo, oculis nigris*; the stature, *Poen.* 1112 *Statura hau magna*, or the degree of one's birth, *Cist.* 130 *sicyone, summo genere*.

The objection against Krüger's distinction between a subject thought of "wie er ist" and "wie er sich zeigt" held the ground that it would often amount to a begging of the whole question for us to say what subjective distinction was present to the author's mind. Where an undeniable distinction can be drawn between a permanent and a transient, an external and an internal, a physical and an abstract quality, we shall have ground for the assertion of a difference in the author's subjective attitude towards the qualities

expressed. But, when no such clear distinction appears, are we then to deny the subjective difference in the author's ideas? We say in English "a man with a lofty character," and again, "a man of lofty character." We speak in both cases of the same man, but we feel the difference between the two ideas. Shall we then deny a similar subjective distinction to the minds of the Roman writers, who said: Cic. de Fin. 2, 105 *magno hic ingenio*, and Suet. gramm. 7, *fuisse dicitur ingenii magni* (of Antonius Gniphō)? We need not contend that *ingenium* was a different thing in the cases of Themistocles and Gniphō, but simply that the two ideas here expressed were differently felt. We speak in English of a man "of the greatest kindness," and within an hour we refer to him again as "with the greatest kindness." The two notions are distinct, but we mean the same individual. Is there not a similar subjective distinction expressed when Cicero says, Fam. 13, 23, 2, *hominem summa probitate, humanitate observantiaque cognoscēs*, and Fam. 16, 4, 2, *suavissimum hominem summi officii summaque humanitatis*? Of course, these English phrases are for illustration, not for argument. That a distinction is felt in English is no proof that it was felt also by the Latin mind. Its existence in English, however, does illustrate the possibility of its existence elsewhere, and it must be admitted that if we fancy its existence in Latin we shall scarcely be able to look for a setting right through any proof of its non-existence.

While this characteristic distinction between the "with" and "of" cases is largely subjective in the constructions of Ablative and Genitive of Quality, yet we should not overlook certain groups of these Ablative and Genitives where the distinction to be made is objective. Thus, *eiusmodi* is invariable in the Genitive, offering an objective difference from *eo modo*, which would not be reckoned at all as a *qualitatis* phrase. Again, *maximi pretii* does not correspond objectively with an Ablative of Quality *maximo pretio*, if the latter phrase could be found. Again, we should think of very different objects if we took in mind first a *vallum trium pedum* and then a *vallum tribus pedibus*; and so with all the expressions of measure in the Genitive of Quality. Thus also expressions like *multi cibi hospitum*, *multi ioci*; *multi sudoris res*, etc., are not objectively the same as *multo cibo hospitum*, *multo sudore res*. The Ablative is too literal. How could a "res" be *multo sudore*? In other highly figurative expres-

sions, too, like *homo trium litterarum* the Genitive has no objective correspondence with an Ablative. We never find a thief (*fur*) described as *homo tribus litteris*. It is interesting to note that nearly all the early Genitives in use are such as show this objective difference from the Ablative. Many of them are figurative, whereas the Ablatives are chiefly descriptive of qualities literally construed. A few early Genitives which show no objective difference are the following: Plaut. *Men.* 269 *animi perdit*; Most. 814 *humani ingeni* || *humano ingenio*||; Bacc. 7 *mi cognominis*; Bacc. 770 *magnæ dividiæ*; Enn. *Euhem.* fig. 4, v. 50 *virilis sexus* (?) Ter. *Andr.* 608 *multi consilii*; C. I. L. 1086 *maximæ probitatis*. These are unusual for early Latin. It is with Cicero that the Genitive first becomes common in a use showing what we have called the subjective difference between Genitive and Ablative.

For testing our own ideas of the degree of distinction between these two constructions we shall have no clearer field than that afforded by the instances where both Ablative and Genitive appear side by side within the limits of the same sentence and especially where they modify the same noun. This is our warrant for bringing forward in the present chapter examples of the sort just described. Our grammarians are accustomed to quote a few well-worn passages in illustration of the phenomena before us, and to draw the conclusion that both cases "may often be used indifferently" (A. & G., 251, a). "Unterscheidet sich nicht wesentlich," says Draeger. "Otherwise there is often no difference" is Gildersleeve's guarded phrase. We have at hand a hundred passages which furnish instances of enallage, or have been so understood by various commentators. Taking them up in order we ought to find the truth about the relation of the two cases abundantly illustrated.

1. Plaut. *Vid.* v. 42 *Si tibi pudico hominest opus et non malo*  
*Qui tibi fidelior sit quam servi tui*  
*Cibique minumi maxumaque industria*  
*Minime mendace, em me licet conducere*

A Genitive here instead of the Ablative *maxima industria* would have been foreign to Plautine usage, for *industria* is an attribute used by way of straightforward description and used literally. On the other hand *cibi minumi* is quite a different thing. The idea expressed by it is not such as could have been conveyed by *cibo minumo*.

The significant fact is that *cibi minumi* is related to a class of Genitives which are apparently translations of Greek adjective compounds in *πόλυ*, as has been noted in Chapter II, page 36. These Genitives never appear in Ablative form and seem to have come early into use and to have remained fixed in usage as they entered it. Thus, beside our example of *cibi minumi*, we may place Cic. Fam. 9, 26, 4 *non multi cibi hospitem accipies, multi ioci*; Sueton. Aug. 76 *Cibi plurimi erat atque vulgaris fere*; Galb. 22, *cibi plurimi traditur*; Varro. R. R. 2, 11 *minimi cibi*; Fronto 32 *neque est Gratia mea, ut causicorum uxores feruntur multi cibi*. Here then we should not say that there is no difference between Ablative and Genitive, but rather that the distinction is such as would allow neither to be replaced by the other.

2. Ter. Adel. 441 di boni  
 Ne illius modi iam nobis magna civium  
 Penurias antiqua virtute ac fide.

The Ablatives here are regular according to the usage of Plautus and Terence, expressing literal characteristics in immediate and evident connection with the subject. The Genitive, a compound of *modi*, is, however, totally different, both in origin and in usage. Certainly it was felt throughout all the literature to be so different that it was never paralleled by an Ablative form.

3. Cic. Verr. 5, 30 *Inter eiusmodi viros et mulieres, adulta ætate filius versabatur, ut eum, etiamsi natura a parentis similitudine abriperet, consuetudo tamen disciplina patris similem esse cogeret.*

Assuming that *adulta ætate* is Ablative of Quality we have *eiusmodi* and *adulta ætate* in the same sentence, though modifying different nouns. The distinction between compounds of *modi* and the Ablative we have discussed under the preceding example. *Eiusmodi* is like the other compounds of *modi*, appearing always in the Genitive. The regularity of *ætate* in the Ablative of Quality is shown by Cicero's use of it in the following passages: Verr. 3, 160 *in epulis adulta ætate inter impudicas mulieres versatus*; Or. post Red. 28 *quacunque aut ætate aut valetudine esset*; Quir. 6 *iam spectata ætate filius*; Deiot. 27 *is ea existimatione eaque ætate saltavit*; Clu. 51 *qua (ætate) tum eram*; Div. Caec. 70 *accusatorem ea ætate,*



cum ædilitatem petat; Acad. 2, 125 innumerabiles paribus in locis esse eisdem nominibus, honoribus . . . ætatibus; Off. 2, 87 iste fere ætate cum essemus, qua es tu nunc; Nat. Deor. 1, 81 deos ea . . . ætate; Cat. Maj. 47 cum ex eo (Sophocle) quidem iam adfecto ætate quæreret; Tusc. 5, 62 adulescens improvida ætate; Fam. 10, 3, 3 consul designatus, optima ætate, summa eloquentia; Att. 4, 16, 3 qui et ætate et valetudine fuit ea qua memenisti. Aside from De Div. 2, 88, which will be discussed at No. 5 below, there is but a single example of the Genitive to set over against these Ablatives. Div. Cæc. 41 eiusdem ætatis nemo aut pauci, and this, in view of its solitude as a Genitive of Quality, may possibly be construed as a possessive = "no one of the same period," though that is forced, the natural interpretation being as Genitive of Quality = "no one of the same age (*i. e.*, 37 years)."

4. Cic. Verr. 14, 18. In hac insula extrema est fons aquæ dulcis, cui nomen Arethusa est, incredibili magnitudine plenissimus piscium.

Roby cites this as an example of the Genitive of Quality, though without calling attention to the juxtaposition of the Ablative *incredibili magnitudine*. If we are not to regard *aquæ dulcis* as a genitive of the "Particular Kind or Contents: that in or of which a thing consists" (Roby, § 1302), or a "Genitive of Sort, Material" (Roby, § 1304), then we must at least inquire whether the quality "*aquæ dulcis*" does not pertain to a fons in a way distinguishable from that in which its "*incredibili magnitudine*" does. This difference could be felt in spite of the fact that both were alike permanent qualities and not transitory, and both internal as much as external. If the difference is that *aquæ dulcis* is corporeal while *magnitudine* is abstract, then the cases ought, by our expectation, to be reversed, the abstract appearing in the Genitive and *vice versa*. But Roby has involved us in needless difficulty. *Aquæ dulcis* is not a Genitive of Quality but a Genitive of Material. Lane calls the construction (gram., p. 202) Genitive of Definition.

Were we still to assume that Roby's interpretation of *aquæ dulcis* were right, we might at least show that *incredibili magnitudine* could hardly have appeared in the Genitive of Quality. Cicero uses *magnitudo* only in the Ablative. Verr. 4, 65 simulacrum Iovis ea

magnitudine, ut intellegi posset ad amplissimi templi ornatum esse factum ; 4, 103 dentes eburneos incredibili magnitudine ; Sest. 26 vir incredibili fide, magnitudine animi, constantia ; De Orat. 2, 299 fertur incredibili magnitudine consilii fuisse Themistocles ; Nat. Deor. 2, 92, sidera magnitudinibus immensis ; De Div. 231 mirabili magnitudine uvam invenit ; Rep. 6, 17 sol . . . tanta magnitudine, ut cuncta sua luce compleat. In addition to this fact, the avoidance of the Genitive of Adjectives in -is, -is, which includes incredibilis, would give us a double reason why with aquæ dulcis already written, a change of construction to the Ablative would have to appear.

5. Cic. De Div. 2, 88 Nominat . . Panætius . . Anchialum et Cassandrum, summos astrologos illius ætatis, qua erat ipse, . . hoc prædictionis genere non usos:

Although at first glance illius ætatis looks like a Genitive of Quality, it needs but a moment's attention to the fact that the three astrologers belonged to the same period but were not the same number of years old to see that the meaning is probably = greatest Astrologers of that age in which he lived, where qua is an "in" case ; erat = vivebat ; and illius ætatis = huius sæculi, a possessive, and no Qualitatis at all. Had the meaning been that Anchialus and Cassander were men of the same years as Panætius, born under the same star, we should look for eiusdem and quæ.

6. Cic. Arch. 31 Quare conservate hominem pudore eo, quem . . . ingenio autem tanto, quantum . . . Causa vero eiusmodi, quæ . . . comprobetur.

Mirmont (Ed. Paris, 1895) comments "Le desir d'avoir une periode symétrique à conduit Cicéron à faire une construction singulière; Un homme d'une honorabilité, . . . d'un génie . . . d'une cause." And J. S. Reid (Ed. Cambr., 1897), remarks, in the same manner, "Causa eiusmodi parallel to pudoré eo, ingenio tanto, so eiusmodi is treated as though it were an indeclinable adjective. . . . The use of causa as a qualitative ablative is noticeable, since causa cannot by any stretch be regarded as a quality residing in a man." It is true the phrase causa eiusmodi is odd, but if we free ourselves from the idea that the Ablative of

Quality must express a quality "residing in a man," and come to understand it as setting forth a circumstance or quality perceived in connection with the man, we shall be prepared to accept *causa* with any adjective as an Ablative of Quality.

The genitive here is again a compound of *modi*.

In a different construction we find this same phrase occurring in Cic. Clu. 51 in *eiusmodi causa*.

To avoid this construction of *causa* which seemed so strange Wölfflin proposes, Arch. XI. 484, with a different punctuation, the interpretation of *causa* as nominative, and this possibility ought not to be overlooked.

7. Cic. Fam. 1, 7, 11 *Lentulum eximia spe, summæ virtutis adolescentem . . . fac erudias (summa virtute M summæ virtutis G R M\*)*.

Krüger cites this example as given, to illustrate his statement that the Genitive shows the subject "wie er ist," the Ablative "wie er sich zeigt," and translates "einen sehr tugendhaften Jüngling der treffliche Hoffnungen erweckt." Zumpt cites the same passage in illustration of his statement that beyond a certain point no sure line can be drawn between Ablative and Genitive. Tyrrell reads as above cited, without comment, and so do Supple, Watson and Muirhead. Mendelssohn corrects the error into which the editors have fallen by reading here with M., *Lentulum eximia spe summa virtute*. The correctness of the reading of M is sustained by two facts which have been brought to light by the present investigation. First, if the Genitive of Quality *summæ virtutis* had been used here, it would have been the first instance of its use in Latin literature and contrary both to the general usage of the time and to that of the author here using it. There are only three instances of *summus* in the first declension used in the Genitive of Quality by Cicero previous to 59 B. C., the date of this letter. Verr. 2, 3, 103 *summæ industriæ*; Font. 16 *summæ auctoritatis*; Rosc. Com. 16 *summæ existimationis*. Add to these Sull., 34 *summi consilii* Verr. 2, 3, 103 *summi laboris* and Font. 41 *summi consilii* and the number of instances of *summus* in either declension in the Genitive of Quality remains small. Although few, these instances might have given Cicero the analogy for a logical use of *summæ virtutis* in this place if Cicero had so elected. That he did not so elect is evi-

dent from his use of *summa virtute* in Verr. 2, 3, 60, and Sull. 42, and later in De Or. 3, 87 *summa virtute et prudentia*; Fam. 4, 6, 1 *summo ingenio summa virtute filium*; Fam. 11, 22, 2 *hominem summo ingenio summa virtute*; Phil. 3, 36 *summa prudentia virtute concordia*; Phil. 10, 3 *summa virtute gravitate constantia*. Not until towards the end of Cicero's life, when the Genitive of Quality had greatly spread, in several channels, and been used by such a conservative writer as Cæsar, did an instance of *summæ virtutis* creep into Cicero's use; Cat. Maj. 59 *Lysander Lacedæmonius, vir summæ virtutis*. In the second place the use of such a Genitive as *summæ virtutis* by the side of *eximia spe* is unlikely because of the usage of *spe*.

It has been pointed out at page 25 that *spe* is used in the Ablative of Quality in early Latin and in Cicero, and later, to denote the hope which the subject feels. In the instance before us, however, *spe* is not the hope which the subject feels, but the hope which the subject (*Lentulus*) awakens and which the observer feels, differing thus objectively from the *spe* of the early examples. Now it is not strange that Cicero, writing in the year 56 B. C., before the use of many Genitives of Quality was strong about him, should have followed the unbroken usage of the early time, and of his own, and written down even this different kind of hope in the Ablative, just as he wrote *summa virtute* in the Ablative. But had he been in the mood for coining new Genitives, as he must have been had he written *summæ virtutis*, then is there not a great probability that he would also have taken advantage of the objective difference between the old "hope" idea of *spes* and his new "promise" idea, and coined also the Genitive *spei*, instead of leaving that for Cæsar in the next decade? That Cicero did not coin *spei* is evidence that he did not coin *virtutis*, but wrote, as *M* preserves the reading, *summa virtute*.

8. Cic. Q. F. 2, 9, 4 *Lucretii poemata ut scribis, ita sunt, multis luminibus ingenii, multæ tamen artis*.

Muller reads as above, with the critical comment || non multis multi—etiam pro tamen. Or. Wesenb. Baier. Infinitus est numerus conjecturarum ||. Tyrrell cites || ita . . . artis ] *M*; lita pro ita *R*.; non ita sunt, Vict.; non multis luminibus, Ern.; non multæ artis, Kl.; Multæ etiam artis, Or.; ut scribis ita sunt, multis lumini-

bus ingenii; multæ tamen artis esse cum inveneris, virum te putabo; Si Salustii Empedoclea legeris, hominem non putabo, H. A. J. Munro. ||

All the questions concerning the reading of this much disputed passage we may dismiss from the present discussion, since in every case we are left with an Ablative luminibus and a Genitive artis, the nature of which will be the same whether we read multæ or nullius. The difficult questions of interpretation, also, we shall not attempt to decide. It is, however, at the least, worthy of remark that plurals appear oftenest in the Ablative, as does luminibus; and that this Ablative is clearly felt as a "with" case and hence is logically used. On the other hand multæ artis is highly figurative, as Tyrrell notes, to Fam. 7, 1, 2, where Rosc. Am. 6 and Fam. 9, 26, 4 are also cited. Our phrase would correspond to a Greek adjective *πολύτεχνος* and the regular appearance of such phrases in the Genitive has been discussed under No. 1.

9. Cic De Leg. 3, 45 Quo verius in causa nostra vir magni ingenii summaque prudentia, L. Cotta, dicebat . . . nihil actum esse de nobis.

B. & K. no variant. Orelli & Baiter read magno ingenio and annotate || O. cum Davisio ||. "Eine eigenthümliche Mischung" remarks Stegmann over this example. The comment of Feldhügel (cited by Du Mesnil, Lpz. 1879), is to the same effect, and supports the reading by the well-known passages from Cic. Brut. 67, 237; Nep. Dat. 3, 1; Cic. Fam. 1, 7, 11, and Off. 1, 19, 99, although of these none shows a Genitive ingenii, whereas the first shows an Ablative ingenio. The oddity of the example, to Feldhügel's mind, consists apparently merely in the juxtaposition of the two cases. Certainly there is nothing odd in Cicero's use of the Ablative summa prudentia. Cf. Fam. 3, 7, 5 homo summa prudentia; Fam. 4, 2, 2 summaque prudentia; De Or. 3, 87 summa virtute et prudentia; Phil. 3, 36 summa prudentia virtute concordia; Phil. 2, 13 summo ingenio summaque prudentia. But with this last example, summo ingenio summaque prudentia in mind, Stegmann may well have thought magni ingenii summaque prudentia odd; and especially when he remembered the forty-five instances of ingenium in the Ablative of Quality which he had cited from Cicero (to which may be added twelve more from Cicero, which Stegmann's

investigation did not include). The use of *ingenio* in the Ablative of Quality by all the early writers as well as Cicero is overwhelmingly preponderating.

Plautus uses it 13 times; Terence 8 times; Pacuvius twice; Ennius, Cæcilius and Afranius each furnish an example of its use. Over against this multitude of early Ablatives only one early Genitive *ingenii* is at hand; Plaut. *Most.* 814 *Atque esse existumo humani ingenii*; and there the text is disputed, many editors reading *ingenio*.

Cicero's own usage furnishes six instances which seem like Genitive of Quality with *ingenii*, besides the one before us. *Cæc.* 5 *video summi ingenii causam esse*; *Q. Rosc.* 48 *est hoc principium improbi animi miseri ingenii, nulli consilii* (where Müller reads *principio*); *Att.* 1, 20, 1 *te . . . moderatissimum fuisse vehementissime gaudeo idque neque amoris mediocris et ingenii summi ac sapientiæ iudico*; *De Or.* 2, 300 *videsne quæ vis in homine acerrimi ingenii, quam potens et quanta mens fuerit?* *Brut.* 110 *in quibusdam laudandi viri etiam maximi ingenii non essent probabiles tamen industria* (here, again, the text is in dispute); *Orat.* 90 *est autem illud acrioris ingenii, hoc maioris artis*. Stegmann omits three of these, but cites another, *Phil.* 14, 28 which, however, will be found to read *maximi animi*, not *ingenii*.

Of the six examples just cited three involve constructions which are widely different from the ordinary Genitive of Quality. Thus, in *Cæc.* 5, *causam* is only figuratively the subject of *ingenii*; in *Att.* 1, 20, and *Orat.* 90 the Genitives are properly not *qualitatis* at all, but *possessives*. In two other passages the reading of the Genitive is in dispute and this leaves but a single unquestioned Ciceronian instance to support our passage, against the 57 instances in which the Ablative is used. The manuscripts and early editions of the *De Legibus* on which the text of our passage rests are not of the most satisfactory kind. The irregularity of *ingenii* raises the suggestion that Davis and his followers may be right, in spite of the MSS., and Cicero may have written here *magno ingenio*. Otherwise we have certainly "*eine eigenthümliche Mischung.*"

10. *Cic. Brut.* 237 *P. Murena mediocri ingenio sed magno studio rerum veterum litterarum et studiosus et non imperitus, multæ industriæ et magni laboris fuit.*

This is one of the oft-cited instances of both Ablative and Genitive in the same sentence. Stegmann characterizes it as similar to the instance we have just discussed, "an odd mixture." Krüger, on the other hand, sees in it the fair illustration of his law, "soll also eine innere geistige oder sittliche eigenschaft als charakteristisch vorherrschend und das Wesen einer Person bezeichnend, dargestellt werden, so kann nur der Genetiv stehen. Soll sie dagegen nur als eine an der Person erscheinende dargestellt werden, ganz abgesehen davon, ob sie zu dem Wesen derselben gehöre, so steht der Ablativ." He translates accordingly, *M. zeigte wenig Genie, aber einen grossen Eifer für das Alterthum, Fleiss und Anstrengung lagen in seinem Wesen.* For the illumination of this passage let us quote the sentence which follows it, Brut. 237 L. *Turius parvo ingenio, sed multo labore, quoquo modo poterat sæpe dicebat . . .*, and beside this let us set Brut. 240 Q. *Pompeius A. F., qui Bithynicus dictus est, biennio quam nos fortasse maior, summo studio dicendi multaque doctrina, incredibili labore atque industria.* The quality of L. Turius described by *multo labore* is the same, objectively, as that of Murena described by *multi laboris*. So are the *incredibili labore atque industria* of Pompeius, considered objectively, the same as the *multæ industriæ et magni laboris* of Murena, and while special reasons may be given for the case of each instance where it appears; thus, that *incredibili*, preferred in the Ablative, because of its form [cf. page 32], drew *labore* and *industria* with it; that *multa doctrina* is put in Ablative for the sake of symmetry with *summo studio* and the Ablatives following; and that *multo labore* is influenced by the neighborhood of *ingenio*, which, as we have seen page 54, is regular for Cicero; yet it must be admitted that the distinction in question is purely subjective, if it is felt at all. Krüger recognizes such a distinction with the comment "es leuchtet heraus ein, dass es in gewissen Fallen darauf ankommt, wie der Schriftsteller eine Eigenschaft betrachtet und darstellen will."

The weakness of such subjective interpretation we have discussed already at the opening of this chapter. Each reader must judge for himself what distinctions lay in the author's mind. It is not impossible that the use of the Genitives here was influenced by the attempt on Cicero's part to gain at once balance and variety of style. Six attributes are expressed, two by two, for the sake of balance. two in the Ablative, two in the form of adjectives, and two in the Genitive for the sake of variety.

11. Cic. Fam. 4, 8, 1 neque monere te audeo, præstanti prudentia virum, nec confirmare maximi animi hominem unumque fortissimum.

This example illustrates again how far from unanimous the grammarians have been in their views of these constructions, for Kühner cites this instance to illustrate that the genitive sets forth the Subject *wie er ist*, the Ablative *wie er sich zeigt*; Kühner agrees with Krüger, interpreting "Der du vorzügliche Klugheit zeigst, aber maximi animi von dem Charakter." Zumpt sees here an illustration of his statement that "im ubrigen lässt sich keine scharfe Grenze ziehen." Madvig quotes the passage to illustrate that there is no difference between the Ablative and the Genitive. Draeger remarks over it, "Wahrscheinlich nur der Abwechslungs wegen stehen beide Casus in demselben Satz."

That the use of the different cases serves the rhetorical purpose of variety which Draeger recognizes may be at once admitted, and this admission need not necessitate the giving up of Zumpt's contention that there is keine scharfe Grenze, if we will interpret "Scharfe" to suit the case. It is possible, however, to bring into the discussion here two facts apparently unnoticed by the grammarians which go to show that Cicero did not use these cases "nur" der Abwechslungs wegen, but in recognition of a clear distinction between the force of Ablative and Genitive. The first of these has been alluded to already in connection with De Leg. 3, 45 above. It is the fact that homo summæ, etc., prudentiæ was a thing unknown to Cicero's usage, homo summa prudentia being the old-fashioned form of phrase with which he and his predecessors always characterized a man of this description. Compare not only Fam. 3, 7, 5; 4, 2, 2; De Or. 3, 87; Phil. 2, 13 and 3, 36, quoted above, but also Att. 16, 16, B 8; Clu. 47; Clu. 107; Rab. Perd. 26; De Div. 2, 50; Cæc. 34, for Cicero's unvaried use of prudentia in the Ablative. So, then, Cicero has not chosen to use here an Ablative instead of a Genitive for the mere sake of variety, but he used the Ablative because it was the only form of this idea familiar to him, the Genitive of Quality prudentiæ not yet having been formulated. It may be noted here, too, that had Cicero been inclined at this time to invent the Genitive prudentiæ, as Hirtius did two or three years later, he would hardly have done it in connection with this adjective præ-



tanti, which seems, like most adjectives in-is, to furnish no instance of use in the Genitive of Quality.

The second fact is that to Cicero's mind the difference between *vir maximi animi* and *vir maximo animo* was an objective difference, distinctly marked. Attention has been called in a previous chapter, page 15, to the change of meaning undergone by *animo* between the time of Plautus and that of Cicero. Cicero is the writer who first shows by the use of the Genitive of Quality the distinction in meaning between *animus* = character and *animus* = the frame of mind. And while the great prevalence of the Ablatives *bono animo*, etc., led to the occasional use of the Ablative phrase where the Genitive would have suited better the logic of the situation, yet Cicero never went so far as to use the phrase *maximo animo* where he referred to the character, but only *maximi animi*. Indeed, out of ninety-nine cases in which he does use the Ablative of Quality with *animo*, to which may be added the sixty-three cases of *animo* in earlier writers, only one contains the phrase *maximo animo*, and that is *Fam.* 4, 13, 7 *extremum illud est, ut te orem et obsecrem animo ut maximo sis nec solum memineris*, etc., where plainly the phrase is only a rhetorical exaggeration of *bono animo sis* and has not at all the force of the Genitives *maximi animi*. For all Cicero's urging, in the passage just cited, Figulus could not at will have become *vir maximi animi*, though he might have become, for the time being, *maximo animo*, which is objectively quite a different thing.

12. *De Nat. Deor.* 2, 48 *Nec enim hunc ipsum mundum pro certo rotundum esse dicitis; nam posse fieri ut sit alia figura, innumerabilesque mundos alios aliarum esse formarum.*

*Alia figura* is regular. *Aliarum formarum* is unusual and seems to be prompted by the same desire for variety which prompted also the use in the second phrase of a synonym *formarum* in place of *figura*, together with a different construction of the verb and the use of *alios* in the distributive sense. *Aliarum formarum* is the more remarkable, too, because in addition to being a Genitive of Quality in the plural, which is in general uncommon, it involves the rhyme *arum -arum*, which all good writers preferred to avoid, cf. page 35. This is the only instance of *formarum* in the Genitive of Quality, and it is further remarkable, because at this time there

was only the Ablative of the singular in use, the Genitive formæ not appearing until Horace.

13. Cic. Phil. 2, 13 *vir summo ingenio summæ prudentiæ*.

Concerning this instance cited by Mühlmann, which contradicts Cicero's unvaried usage in respect to *prudentiæ*, it is necessary only to observe that the modern editors all read *summaque prudentia*, to which the critical editions record no variant.

14. Att. 14, 14, 2 *quum dedissem ad te litteras VI. kalend satis multis verbis, tribus fere horis post accepi tuas, et magni quidem ponderis*.

Cicero would hardly allow a genitive to stand here in the place of *multis verbis*, because of the objection to the rhyme *orum -orum*, page 35. The Genitive *magni ponderis* is justified also, on several grounds. First, the Genitive is logical for expressions of weight (which is an inherent and permanent quality), as we have remarked at page 43. Second, it coincides with Cicero's usage, which has, with one exception, the metaphorical expressions of weight in the Genitive. Thus, Vatin, 9 *boni viri iudicent, id est maximi momenti et ponderis*; Plauc. 4 (*merita Plaucii*) *magni . . ponderis apud vos esse debere*; Fam. 2, 19, 2 *tuæ litteræ . . maximi sunt apud me ponderis*; and here, *litteras magni ponderis*. The exception is Att. 10, 1, 1 *filius eodem est apud me pondere*. On the other hand, Cicero uses twice *grandi pondere* in the Ablative; Cic. Verr. 2, 4, 32, *hydriam grandi pondere* and Nat. Deor. 3, 83 *amiculum grandi pondere*, both times of literal physical weight.

Third, there is occasion here for a variation from the Ablative phrase, which has just been used, for the sake of emphasis, and Cicero has also sought this through the use of *et—quidem*. This letter which he is acknowledging was, indeed, *magni ponderis*, for it was important, that is, metaphorically *magni ponderis*, and it was bulky, literally *magni ponderis*. Its contents included: 1st, news of "*Quintus noster coronatus*"; 2d, the jokes about Vestorius and Pherionum; 3d, the defense of Brutus and Cassius; 4th, matters of *ista πολιτικώτερα*; 5th, Atticus, counsel concerning the Ides of March; 6th, news of Antonium de provinciis relaturum (this might be important); 7th, *Rapinas ad Opis*; 8th, *hortaris me ut historias scribam*;

9th, de omnibus meis consiliis ut scribis . . . fiat; 10th, quod me cogitare jubes; 11th, pleasing little postscript.

15. Cæs. B. G. 7, 39 Eporedorix Æduus, summo loco natus adulescens et summæ domi potentiæ, et una Viridomarus, pari ætate et gratia sed genere dispari, . . . convenerant.

Many considerations might be advanced here as affecting the use of Ablative and Genitive respectively. In the first place the Ablatives *pari* and *dispari* are made necessary by the non-existence of the Genitive *paris*; see page 27. Again, a variety to the style is afforded by the alternation of constructions. Again, had an Ablative *summa domi potentia* been used, the style would not have been so clear, for after *summo loco natus* and the co-ordinate conjunction *et* another Ablative would not have suggested so infallibly the different dependence of the idea expressed by *summæ potentiæ*.

16. Nep. Dat. 3 Thuyn, hominem maximi corporis terribilique facie, quod et niger et capillo longo barbaque promissa, optima veste textit.

This is another of those examples which have gone the rounds of the grammarians and been used, in turn, to illustrate the views of each.

To Draeger it shows no difference in the meanings and appears thus “nur der Abwechslungs wegen.” To Zumpt it shows no sharp distinction between the cases.

To Krüger the Genitive appears as relating to the very being of the man, the Ablative only to his appearance, readily alterable. Lane translates so as to show the characteristic difference “a man of gigantic frame and with an awe-inspiring presence.”

Lupus comments, “Der Genetivus und der Ablativus Qualitatis stehen hier neben einander ohne wesentlichen Unterschied des Begriffs” and later he says the construction is due “nur dem Bedürfniss der Abwechslungs.” In like manner Stegmann says (p. 243): “Nicht befreunden kann ich mich mit subtilen distinctionen, wie sie Heraeus, S. 116, anm. 2, gibt, wenn er . . . Nep. Datam 14, 3, 1 . . . durch die Bemerkung erklären will; das schreckliche aussehen wurde gemildert, wenn er sich haupthaar und bart kurz schneiden liesz.”

That there is any "Bedürfniss der Abwechslungs" for the sake of the style here is a thing difficult to see. On the contrary there is one fact, overlooked by all the commentators, which has absolutely determined the usage in one-half of this passage, and that is the form of the word *facie*, as pointed out in the preceding chapter. Had *Nepos* desired to express here an idea more logically to be expressed by the Genitive he would have been driven to forsake his desire by this fact of form alone.

With the use of *facie*, then, prescribed from the beginning, if the author felt a distinction between Ablative and Genitive he was only free to manifest it in his use of the Genitive and this manifestation seems to occur.

A Genitive *corporis* is almost unknown to Latin literature before *Livy*, the only instances at hand being the one before us and a passage from *Hor. Epist.* 1, 20, 24 where the Genitive form is required by the metre. On the other hand, 35 instances of the Ablative *corpore* can be cited previous to *Livy* and almost as many later. It is remarkable that of all the instances of *corpore* in the Ablative not one has the adjective *maximo*. Perhaps a reason for this can be found if we consider some of the adjectives which do appear, such as these: *albo*, *aquilo*, *immani*, *præstanti*, *firmitate*, *exiguo*, *incolumi*, *gravi*, *infirmo*, *ægro*, *inculto*, *horrido*, *magno*, *candenti*, *fesso*, *insigni*, *detorto*, *vesco*, *decoro*, *integro*, *adfecto*, *obeso*, *brevi*, *humili*, *minori*, *vegeto*, *valenti*, *salubri*, *inlibato*.

All these Ablatives refer to the literal body. What, then, would be logically *homo maximo corpore*? The man with the largest body, in comparison with several or all others. But what is the meaning in our example, *hominem maximi corporis*? *Lane* has rendered it a "man of gigantic frame." By a simple rhetorical figure the size of the body has come to be put for the body itself, and the figurative expression is put in the Genitive, just as in the earlier instances, *Fam.* 7, 1, 2; 9, 26, 4; *Most.* 782; *Men.* 100; *Aul.* 325, and those mentioned on page 35 ff. This difference between the literal and the figurative domains of the ideas gives a ground for a distinction between the use of the Ablative and the Genitive ideas.

17. *Sall. Hist.* 2, 16 *Maur.* = *Suet. de Gramm.* c. 15; "ut *Lenæus* . . . *Sallustium historicum*, quod eum (scil. *Pompeium*) oris probi, animo inverecundo scripsisset,

acerbissima satira laceraverit." (Inc. 75 D. 41 K. II, 21 G. II, p. 586 Br.) Præterea cf. Sacerdot. (VI, p. 461) illud de Pompeio, qui coloris erat rubei, sed animi inverecundi. Plin. VII, 53: 'Magno Pompeio Vibius quidam . . . et Publicius fuere similes illud *os probum* red-dentes,' id. XXXVII 14; 'erat et imago Cr. Pompeii e margantis . . . illius probi oris vener-andique per cuncas gentes' || probi] VLO, improbi N G O Kritz, sed illud legerat Plinius.

We have here none of Sallust's context, but none is necessary for our understanding of the passage. Sallust made an epigram on Pompey of such point that it stirred the bitter wrath of Pompey's friend Lenæus, was celebrated for generations succeeding (witness Plin. and Suet.) and was still current three centuries later and explained by Sacerdos.

This was in accordance with Sallust's well-known tendency to variety in style, concerning which see Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa* I, 204, where, however, the illustration cited, Sall. Cat., 33, 1 plerique, patriæ, sed omnes fama atque fortuna expertes, must be replaced, since the better reading is patria sede.

Now, an epigram is not the place for ordinary expression of bare fact. Boldness of expression couples with antithesis of form and every rhetorical device to make the epigram effective. So it is here.

The "honest countenance" is set in contrast with the shameless mind; a contrast which Sacerdos felt and expressed with sed. Sallust showed this contrast in thought by a contrast in constructions. With regard to oris probi it may be said that such an expression is figurative, and just as the few classical instances of a bodily part used figuratively are in the Genitive, so here appears the Genitive oris probi; cf. Cic. Orat. 85; valentiorum laterum Orat., 76 plurimi sanguinis; Fam. 7, 1, 2 non tui stomachi; Hor. Sat. I. 4, 8 emunctæ naris; Epod. 12, 3 naris obesæ; Val. 3, 2, 21 flagrantissimi pectoris.

An attempted explanation of oris probi on the basis that the expression was sarcastic is discredited by Wölfflin, *Archiv.* XI, 4 p.

489, and will be omitted here. Besides the arguments there advanced the following passage from Seneca seems also to count against the sarcastic interpretation. Epist. 1, 11, 31 nihil erat mollius ore Pompei numquam non coram pluribus erubuit.

18. Livy I, 11, 8 Quod Sabini aureas armillas magni ponderis brachio lævo gemmatosque magna specie anulos habuerint.

This instance of the variation between Ablative and Genitive of Quality different editors have differently accounted for. That magna specie is adverbial to gemmatos is unlikely. That it is required merely for the sake of variety in the style is doubtful. A sufficient reason for the juxtaposition of the two cases here is seen in two facts, one of which, at least, has escaped all the editors; first, Livy is the first writer to show the evidence of that great movement towards the free use of the Genitive of Quality which carried the immediately succeeding writers Valerius and Velleius almost clear of the use of any Ablatives of Quality, while making their Genitives so frequent. For the effect of this change in usage on expressions of the idea of pondus see page 43. What we need to note here is that ponderis is Livy's unvaried usage, a usage apparently grounded in a perception of a logical distinction between the force of the Genitive and of the Ablative. The second fact concerns specie. Neither Livy nor any other writer before Palladius (355-395 A. D.) recognized the permissibility of a Genitive of Quality in place of specie, owing, as we have seen page 23, to the form.

19. Liv. 6, 22, 7 Exactæ iam ætatis Camillus erat, sed vegetum ingenium in vivo pectore vigeat, virebatque integris sensibus, . . . .

It seems too great a stretch to regard integris sensibus here as Ablative of Quality, though under Golling's definition it might be held that it describes the noun Camillus rather than the manner in which he flourished. The use of the Genitive here accords with the general swing toward a preference for expressing the Genitive forms of ideas. At an earlier day we should have had the form ætate, as already remarked in connection with Cæs. 7, 39 and Verr. 5, 32.

20. Liv. 27, 19, 8 Cum Afros venderet iussu imperatoris quæstor puerum adultum inter eos forma insigni cum audisset regii generis esse ad Scipionem misit.

Since the first instance we have of *insignis* in the Genitive of Quality occurs in Justinus, and so late as Tacitus only the Ablative form of this adjective appears, we could hardly look for a Genitive formæ *insignis* here, although with an adjective of the first decl. Livy could and did use the Genitive formæ, 44, 28 *eximiæ equos formæ*, notwithstanding all precedent to the contrary; cf. *eximia forma*, Cic. Tusc. 5, 61; Ter. Andr. 72; Plaut. Stich., 381; Merc., 260, 210, 13.

The contrast between Ablative and Genitive here serves also a rhetorical purpose by distinguishing between the relations in which the two qualities are felt to stand towards their subject. Thus, the fact that a grown boy furnished a noble exterior would not have prevented his being sold by the quæstor, but the fact that he belonged to a royal family was of very different importance and caused him to be sent to Scipio.

21. Liv. 30, 4, 1 Calonum loco primos ordines spectatæ virtutis atque prudentiæ servili habitu mittebat.

The Genitive *virtutis atque prudentiæ* is logical, and for Livy regular, though an earlier writer would probably have used *virtute atque prudentia*, as commented above to Cic. Fam. 1, 7, 11 and Cic. Phil. 2, 13. The juxtaposition of two cases here is brought about by the meaning of *servili habitu*.

If the Ablative of Quality describes the subject at the time of its manifestation, but the Genitive the characteristic which belongs to a person, then the Genitive *habitus* would have been distinctly out of place here and the Ablative *habitu* altogether appropriate, for these soldiers merely were sent out in servile garb; they were not men of characteristically servile appearance. A distinction between *habitu* as clothing and *habitus* as the character of the appearance may be observed elsewhere. Thus, compare the Genitives in Val. Max. 5, 1, 7 *puer eximiæ formæ et liberalis habitus*, and Plin., N. H. 35, 114 *Gryllum deridiculi habitus* with the Ablatives in Liv. 26, 6, 11 *habitu Italico*; Tac. Ann. 4, 59 *habitu tali repertus est*; Ann. 12, 41 *puerili habitu*.

22. Liv. 31, 21, 6 in Sabinis incertus infans natus, masculus an femina esset, alter sedecim iam annorum item ambiguo sexu inventus.

The Genitive *annorum* is regular and unavoidable, but the reason for the use of *ambiguo sexu* is farther to seek. Livy had already used the Genitive in 26, 34, 5 *puberes virilis sexus*, and this usage was followed by Tac., Ann. 1, 58; 2, 38; 2, 84; 6, 19; Suet., Aug. 101; Fronto, Strat. 1, 11, 6; Justin., 1, 4, 7; 37, 1; 53, 2, though the earlier usage had been invariable in the Ablative. That there is any physical difference between *puer virilis sexus* and *puer virili sexu* could not be maintained. Whether in our passage there is a subjective difference in the Latin similar to that which one feels in English between the phrases a child sixteen years old of doubtful sex was discovered, and, a child sixteen years old was discovered with its sex doubtful, may be left for each observer to determine. That there is no *sexus ambiguus* to which a child could belong, as he might belong to the *sexus virilis* may also be taken into account here.

23. Liv. 38, 24, 2 *Orgiagontis reguli uxor forma eximia custodiebatur inter plures captivas; cui custodiae centurio praeerat et libidinis et avaritiæ militaris.*

*Forma eximia* was from the earliest times a set phrase, of sufficiently frequent occurrence to suggest its use by Livy, both here and at 26, 50, 1. See also the comment on page 64 to Liv. 27, 19, 8. The growing preference for the Genitive forms is seen in Livy's use of *equos eximiæ formæ* at 44, 28, and this same preference appears in the use of *libidinis* and *avaritiæ* in our example.

24. Val. Max. 1, 7.7 *existimavit ad se venire hominem ingentis magnitudinis, coloris nigri, squalidum barba et capillo inmisso.*

The distinction here between the use of Genitive and of Ablative is entirely clear. It lies in the peculiarity of Valerius' style, shared by other writers of his time, which led him to throw every one of his "qualitatis" ideas into the Genitive form, except in three instances; 1, 1, Ext. 16 *eximia facie*; 3, 2, 23 *capite, umero, femine saucio oculo eruta*, and the one before us, *capillo inmisso*. Of these the first was impossible in the Genitive because of the form of *facie*, as



shown on pages 16. The other Ablatives are parts of the body which Valerius never uses in the Genitive.

For defense of *capillo inmisso* as Ablative of Quality and not Ablative Absolute, cf. Golling, *Gym.* VI, 2, page 43. In our example is further to be noted the new construction of *squalidum barba* = *squalida barba*, which offers an additional means of variety to the style and of escape from the old-fashioned Ablative of Quality.

25. Plin. N. H. 7, 24 *choromandarum gentem vocat Tauron silvestrem, sine voce, stridoris horrendi, hirtis corporibus oculis glaucis, dentibus caninis.*

26. 11, 274 *contra longæ esse vitæ incurvos umeris et in manu unam aut duas incisuras longas habentes et plures quam XXXII dentes auribus amplis.*

27. 12, 46 *distat quod sine cauliculo est et quod minoribus foliis quodque radices neque amaræ neque odoratæ.*

28. 12, 56 *contorti esse caudicis ramis aceris maxime Pontici.*

29. 25, 74 *simplici caule, minimis foliis floris copiosi erumpentis cum uva maturescit, odore non iniucundo.*

30. 25, 110 *quæ feniculi similitudine candidioribus foliis et minoribus hirsutisque, caule pedali recto, radice suavissimi gustus et odoris.*

31. 27, 44 *herba foliis duris cineracei coloris, . . . , viticulis longis, callosis rubentibus.*

32. 27, 83 *humilis herba densis foliis fere papaveris, minoribus tamen sordidioribusque, odoris tætri gustus amari cum adstrictione.*

33. 27, 115. *tertium genus, . . . uno caule densis geniculis et in se infarctis, foliis autem piceæ, radices superævuæ.*

34. 27, 118 *Pancratium . . . foliis albi lili longioribus crassioribusque, radice bulbi magni, colore rufo.*

35. 27, 122 Poterion . . . . languine spissa, foliis parvis,  
rotundis, et amulis longis, mollibus, lentis,  
tenuibus, flore longo, herbacei coloris.
36. 31, 47 Terra vero ipsa promittit candicantibus maculis aut tota  
glauco coloris.

Before citing, in addition to these twelve instances from Pliny eleven more which involve the juxtaposition of Ablative and Genitive of Quality, we shall be able to realize that we have come upon an author who shows a new freedom in the use of these constructions. A two-fold reason is not far to seek. Pliny, in the first place, found himself with a wavering tradition behind him regarding the use of these cases. The republican writers had used Ablatives vastly in the preponderance. Writers after Livy had used Genitives almost exclusively. Where later usage had conflicted with earlier, whose authority was Pliny to follow? In the second place, in a work somewhat of the nature of a descriptive catalogue, how could Pliny resist the temptation to gain for his style whatever variety was possible by resorting to all known expedients of change in form.

This second point is fully observed by Johannes Müller, who says (Stil des Aelteren Plinius III, § 181) "Bei einem Werke mit der Anlage und Behandlungsweise der N. H. war für die Darstellung keine Gefahr grössere als in Einförmigkeit zu verfallen," and in illustration of Pliny's effort to avoid this danger, he devotes paragraphs and sections to "Wiederholung desselben Wortes nach kurzem Zwischenraume"; "Gleichmässiger Anfang"; "Mannigfaltigkeit"; "Abwechslung zwischen. 1. Sing. und Pl; 2. die Casus; 3. Gen. od. abl. qual. u. adj.; 4. abl. qual. u. relationis; 5. abl. qual. od. adj. u. Dat. des Besitzes oder habere," etc., etc.

He says (§ 22, 2): "Speciell die Abwechslung zwischen Gen. u. Abl. qual., bei den Aelteren Schriftstellern durchaus selten auch bei den späteren nicht häufig, ist dem Plinius ganz Geläufig."

Under such circumstances we shall expect to find the difference between the two cases pressed to its lowest point and every subjective discrimination sunk occasionally under the desire for variety. Yet even in Pliny the instances show the cases not used with entire indifference. For instance, Pliny uses, as the examples cited above all show, only the Ablative in the plural. The only exception is

37. 21, 23 nec ulli florum excelsitas maior, interdum cubitorum trium, languido semper collo et non sufficienti capitis oneri.

where the construction is one of Measure the use of which in the Genitive was uniform. See note to Cic. N. D., 2, 48 above and to Livy 31, 12.

Again, grammatical clearness sometimes required the use of one or the other construction. Thus with Nos. 29, radice suavissimi gustus et odoris; 30, foliis cineracei coloris; 31, foliis odoris tætri gustus amari; 33, radice bulbi magni, and 35, flore herbacei coloris, compare.

38. 12, 47 radice galli nardi semine acinosum, saporis calidi.

39. 12, 56 folio piri, minore dumtaxat et herbidi coloris.

40. 21, 25 gemino caule, carnosiore radice maiorisque bulbi.

In the last example, for instance, a maioreque bulbo would modify not radice, as here intended, but the same subject which caule and radice modify, and it is in just the same way that in No. 25 above the Genitive stridoris horrendi after sine voce frees the style from grammatical obscurity. These two requirements of Ablatives for the plural and the forced use of cases for grammatical distinctness account for the use of all the Ablatives and Genitives in Nos. 31 and 34.

Add to these the fact that Pliny always puts parts of the human body, like collo, capite, dorso, ore (except *illius probi oris*) barba, capillo, auribus, pedibus, oculis, dentibus, in the Ablative, and that he seems to feel sometimes the analogy with parts of the human body of parts of vegetables' bodies, as caule, folio, ramis, baxis, cortice, frutice, and we shall thus have accounted also for Nos. 30, 36 and 40. Curious to observe is that flore and radice, which ought to come in the above list, show exceptions; flore twice, against its regular use in the Ablative twenty times; and radice thrice, against its regular use twenty-one times in the Ablative. Still more curious is that each one of these five exceptions occurs where the Genitive is in juxtaposition with an Ablative. These exceptions appear in Nos. 27, 29 and 33 above and the two following passages:

41. 19, 127 purpuream maximæ radicis Cæcilianam vocant; rotundum vero minima radice ἀστὺν ἰδα.  
 42. 21, 154 candidum radice lignosa, in collibus nascens, . . . alterum nigrius florisque nigri.

Another exception to be mentioned here is that shown by the Genitive contorti caudicis of No. 28 above.

It would be drawing the distinction too fine to say that both flore and radice, above, were potential parts of the plant's body rather than actually manifest parts; that is, that a plant could be flore nigro only when in bloom, but at other times quite as well floris nigri, and radice lignosa when the root could be observed, but radicis neque amaræ nec odoratæ even when it had to be dug for. Such a distinction, however, would not be without analogy. Take, for example, the Genitive in No. 25 above. Longæ vitæ refers to a long life predicted and yet to come, but not actually present, and it might be applied to a youth of twenty. This would certainly not be true of longa vita. A point at which Pliny seems to have allowed his choice of Ablative or Genitive to be affected by declensional form is apparent in this use of coloris and colore. With 14 instances of coloris facing 16 instances of colore it would seem bold to assert that Pliny made a distinction between them, until we compare the instances. When, however, we place beside cineracei coloris (No. 31) and herbacei coloris (No. 36) the following two examples:

43. 26, 37 radix . . coloris intus herbacei crassitudine digiti minimi.

44. 27. 125 femina magis herbacei coloris caule tenui.

we get the suggestion that the form of adjective stems in eo may have constituted a source of distinction in Pliny's mind. By the side of these instances are to be placed the following: 24, 33 mellei coloris; 37, 170 aurei coloris; 27, 83 crocei coloris; 37, 51 coloris aurei.

Now, over against these set:

45. 10, 8 hæc facit ut quintum genus γρηῃσιον vocetur velut verum solumque incorruptæ originis, media magnitudine, colore subrutilo, rarum conspectu,

and with this compare the *colore rufo* of No. 34 above and the whole list of adjectives appearing with *colore*, as follows; *adusto*, *inclinato ad*, *herbido*, *languido*, *subrutilo*, *medio*, *livido*, *languescente*, *subrufo*. If the list stopped here, the distinction above suggested would be clear enough. There are at hand, however, two more Ablatives which must be mentioned; 16, 43 *liquoris melleo colore*, where the Ablative is perhaps suggested by the need of grammatical clearness, and 37, 170 *Idæi dactyli in Creta ferreo colore pollicem humanum exprimunt*, where the Ablative, if not dependent upon *exprimunt*, can only be called an exception.

Before passing to the next example, observe again, in No. 45, the distinction between the relation of the Genitive and that of the Ablatives to their subject. This *γνήσιον* is the true and only percnopterus of pure breed. It has moderate size and a color towards the reddish, and so may a dozen other kinds of percnopteri; but this is the only one of pure breed. The distinction in idea is met with a distinction in case.

Three instances from Pliny remain to be cited:

46. 9, 54 *scorpionis effigie aranei magnitudinis*.

We find no example of *effigie* in the Genitive of Quality and may conclude, therefore, that like *faciei* and *speciei* it was avoided. Had the form *effigiei* been in use, Pliny might have introduced here into the language in place of *scorpionis* the adjective *scorpionius*, instead of at 20, 8, where it does occur for the first time.

47. 18, 37 L. *Tarius Rufus infima natalium humilitate consulatum militari industria meritis antiquæ alias parsimonix.*

Apparently an instance of balanced interchange between Ablative, adjective, and Genitive. Others see in the Ablative, however, not an Ablative of Quality, but of separation.

Other phrases showing a genitive, singular or plural, dependent upon an Ablative of Quality are found elsewhere; for instance:

Tac. Ann. 4, 44 *multa claritudine generis.*

Hist. 4, 15 *claritate natalium insigni.*

*Antiquæ parsimonix* would have appeared only in the Ablative before the beginning of Silver Latin, which for our construction must begin with Livy.

48. 8, 214 Sunt ibices pernecitatis mirandæ, quamquam onerato capite vastis cornibus.

That the quality of pernecitas is related to ibices in a different way from that of capite onerato may afford a distinction of ideas sufficient to warrant a difference in case.

49. Tac. Hist. 1, 14 Piso M. Crasso et Scribonia genitus, nobilis utrimque, vultu habituque moris antiqui.

If the interpretation of moris antiqui as a genitive dependent on vultu habituque could be defended, we should have here a Genitive of Quality lying within the Ablative phrase and forming a part of it. Grammatical clearness would be aided by the Genitive moris antiqui instead of a more antiquo, which, however, for another reason, would never occur, namely, that antiqui moris, like cibi minimi (cf. No. 1) and impetus antiqui (Ann. 13, 54), is a phrase of special sense and somewhat figurative application, of a kind which appears in the Genitive only.

In our passage, however, such an interpretation will not be held. Vultu and habitu depend upon moris antiqui, and we should translate "of the old school in look and appearance."

50. Hist. 2, 64 et pari probitate mater Vitelliorum, Sextila, antiqui moris.

The invariable use of pari in the Ablative has been noted already on page 27. For moris in the Genitive of Quality see the last example. Kuçera in his treatise "Über die Taciteische Inconcinntät," fails to observe this instance.

51. Hist. 4, 15 Erat in Caninefatibus stolidæ audaciæ Brinno, claritate natalium insigni.

Heræus reads insignis, (insigni] insignis Gottl. Keissling u. Wurm), but without sufficient authority. The frequency of such Ablatives as claritate with a dependent Genitive is commented on above, at No. 46. The history of audaciæ illustrates what has been said above, page 14, concerning the development of constructions. Cicero said audacia, Clu. 64, Semper singulari fuit audacia; Fam. 15, 4, 10 his erant finitimi pari scelere et audacia Tebarani (though in both these instances the Genitive of the adjectives used, singularis and paris,

would have been avoided); Att. 7, 7, 6 tanta auctoritate dux, tanta audacia. Sallust begins the use of the Genitive, Cat. 18, adulescens nobilis, summæ audaciæ, which Seneca, of course, takes up, Cont. 1, 2, 3 cuius audaciæ es, puella? Tacitus had behind him a divided tradition and in this instance uses the Genitive. Gellius shows his archaistic tendency by returning to the earlier form; 15, 9, 3 quanta licentia audaciaque Cæcilius hic fuit?

The aim at contrast in this passage, observed by Kuçera and ascribed in general to Tacitus by Draeger, Gantrelle, Zernial and indeed by all writers, is not to be disputed here.

52. Ann. 4, 29 cum primores civitatis . . . Lentulus senectutis extremæ, Tubero defecto corpore.

How great a subjective difference there may have been to Tacitus between *Lentulus senectutis extremæ* and a supposable *Lentulus senectute extrema* cannot be shown. The evident intention for contrast, however, can be made apparent.

The general increase of Tacitus' fondness for contrast seen in the Annals has been pointed out by Wölfflin, *Philol.* 25, 121 ff. In the passage before us the Ablative, *Tubero defecto corpore*, was a foregone conclusion, for, aside from a half dozen instances from Livy and the two Senecas, scarcely an example of the Genitive *corporis* can be found before Tacitus (cf. also note to No. 15). Tacitus himself has invariably followed the early usage: thus *Hist.* 2, 32 *fluxis corporibus*; 4, 46 *intecto corpore*; 4, 77 *intecto corpore*; Ann. 2, 73 *corpore decoro, genere insigni*; 2, 75, *defesso luctu et corpore ægro*; 6, 46 *fesso corpore*; 11, 36 *is modesta iuventa, sed corpore insigni*; 14, 17 *trunco per vulnera corpore*; 15, 34 *corpore detorto*.

But Tacitus' custom is to express the idea of *ætas*, also with the Ablative; thus *Hist.* 3, 33 *exacta ætate feminas*; 3, 67 *fessa ætate parens*; 4, 42 *nondum senatoria ætate*; Ann. 1, 46 *Augustum fessa ætate*; 2, 39 *ætate et forma haut dissimili*; 2, 60 *septingenta milia ætate militari*; 5, 1 *mortem obiit, ætate extrema*; 5, 10 *haud dispari ætate*; 6, 11 *quamquam provecta ætate*; 12, 42 *Vitellius validissima gratia, ætate extrema*; 15, 38 *fessa (fessorum Joh. Müller) ætate*.

It would have been simple for Tacitus to have said here *Lentulus extrema ætate*, as he did say *extrema ætate* Ann. 5, 1 and 12, 42,

for this would have expressed no very different fact about Lentulus; but he sought variety in style and so, after the analogy of other abstracts in the Genitive he introduced here the new phrase *senectutis extremæ*.

53. Ann. 6, 5 *Exim Cotta Messalinus, sævissimæ cuiusque sententiæ auctor eoque inveterata invidia ubi primum facultas data, arguitur pleraque in C. Cæsarem quasi incertæ virilitatis.*

The contrast between Ablative and Genitive here is not so marked because they are not so closely bound together in the construction of the sentence, yet each in its place seems justified. Thus, we should distinguish between the hatred which others feel against Cotta and which he "has" because they put it upon him, and a hatred which Cotta feels because it is a characteristic of his nature. The latter would appear in the Genitive, but the former idea is that which Livy intends to convey.

54. Ann. 4, 61 *Q. Haterius, familia senatoria, eloquentiæ quoad vixit celebratæ;*

The abstract qualities of this and the two following examples are not unnatural in the Genitive. It is to be noted, however, that Tacitus said also, Ann. 4, 48 *Balbus, truci eloquentia.*

55. Ann. 6, 15 *Calibus ortus patre atque avo consularibus, cetera equestri familia, mitis ingenio et comptæ facundiæ.*

Contrast here is carried out completely, through the use of *mitis ingenio*, instead of a possible *miti ingenio*, and of *comptæ facundiæ* instead of a possible *compta facundia*.

56. Ann. 6, 31 *Sinnaces, insigni familia ac perinde opibus, et proximus huic Abdus ademptæ virilitatis.*

The preference of Tacitus for the Ablative of the plurals accords with that of the early writers and puts *opum* instead of *opibus* out of the question. The occurrence of the Genitive of the adjective *insignis* in Justinus makes us doubt whether Tacitus would have felt an inclination to avoid its use here.



57. Ann. 5, 1 Julia Augusta mortem obiit, ætate extrema, nobilitatis per Claudiam familiam et adoptione Liviorum Juliorumque clarissimæ.

Again the Ablative *ætate extrema*, the use of which has been illustrated in the note to No. 52. Here it seems as much an "in" case as a "with" case. The Genitive contrasted with it is again an abstract quality. We observe once more the evidence of Tacitus' fondness for contrast in the setting off of *per* with the accusative against adoptione, an Ablative of Means.

58. Ann. 12, 2 Ne femina expertæ fecunditatis, integra iuventa, claritudinem Cæsarum aliam in domum ferret.

"A woman of proved fertility, with her youthful vigor still unbroken." The speaker's attitude is different towards the two qualities, the fecundity being looked upon as the attribute which determines the character of the woman.

59. Ann. 13, 54 Quod comiter a visentibus exceptum, quasi impetus antiqui et bona æmulatione. Nero etc.  
|| æmulatione codd.; æmulatio Rhenanus ||.

Says Furneau, ad loc.: "So Halm and Nipperdey after Rhenanus instead of the Med. *æmulatione* (the *ne* being supposed to have arisen out of a repetition of the following word). Others retain the Med. But here the gen. is not strictly that of quality and the abl. could hardly be other than causal, and we should have to explain the sentence (with Gron.) as 'quasi impetus antiqui esset, et æmulatione bona fieret.'"

Draeger, on the other hand, reads *æmulatione* and cites this instance (Stil des Tac., § 283) as an example of co-ordination of Ablative and Genitive of Quality, which is the view held also by Em. Jacob in his Edition (Paris, 1875). Kuçera, by omitting this passage from his list, seems to follow Halm's reading and this is, most recently, the view adopted by Constans in his edition (Paris, 1898).

To the majority Rhenanus' conjecture seems to furnish the easier reading and if we adopt it our example disappears.

60. Ann. 15, 38 ad hoc lamenta paventium feminarum; fessa ætate aut rudis pueritiæ [ætās] ||pueritiæ Jac. Grono-

vius; pueritiæ ætas (fessa aut rudis pueritiæ ætas. *Lipsius*, fessa aut rudis ætas *Haase*||.

The latest editors seem agreed with Halm in regarding [ætas] as a gloss. Draeger, ad loc. comments: "Die paventes zerfallen in drei klassen; Weiber, Greise und Kinder. Ablativ und Genetiv der Eigenschaft hängen also als appositionen von paventium ab, ebenso wie feminarum." Under this interpretation the passage would illustrate Tacitus' tendency to contrast, showing three different styles of expression for three appositional ideas. It is simpler, however, to accept the interpretation suggested by Halm's punctuation and regard rather ætate and pueritiæ as appositional to feminarum.

Fessa ætate is for Tacitus a regular construction (cf. No. 51). Rudis pueritiæ on the other hand is unusual, this phrase not being found elsewhere.

61. Fronto. ad M. Cæs. 2, 5 (p. 30 Naber) Satis ne ego audaci consilio et iudicio temerario videar, cum de tantæ gloriæ viro existimo.

The Ablatives denote the qualities with which the subject momentarily appears and we might easily see here an illustration of Krüger's distinction between the Ablative, showing the subject "wie er sich zeigt" and the Genitive, "wie er ist."

We should observe here, however, that whereas Fronto might say Polemon fuit tanta gloria, we should hardly find him saying de tanta gloria viro, for after de the Ablative gloria would be confusing. This limitation upon the use of the Ablative has been noted already at page 68.

62. Gell. 1, 15, 19 Huiusmodi autem loquacitatem verborumque turbam magnitudine inani vastam.

If we interpret magnitudine inani with either verborum or turbam (= verborum inanissimorum turbam or verborum turbam inanissimam) we have an instance of its juxtaposition as Ablative of Quality with the Genitive huiusmodi. This would offer no peculiarity, as the Genitive would be a compound of modi, and the Ablative a descriptive case, which, though it would appear in the Genitive in Val. Max., or Seneca, is used exclusively in the Ablative by Gellius,

3, 9, 3; 10, 7, 1, illustrating his return to the style of the earlier writers.

If, on the other hand, we interpret *magnitudine* with *vastam* it is no longer Ablative of Quality, and the example falls out.

63. 3, 16, 4 *Cæcilius, quum faceret eodem nomine et eiusdem argumenti comœdiam.*

The difference seems quite as subjective as in the English expression "a comedy with the same name and of the same contents." Yet a similarity of contents does seem deeper than a similarity in name.

64. 9, 4, 6 *qua fuisse facie Cyclopas poetæ ferunt, alios item esse homines apud eandem cæli plagam singulariæ velocitatis.*

The invariability of *facie* owing to its form has been noted already.

*Velocitatis* is an abstract in the Genitive which appeared as early as *Hirtius B. G. 8, 36, summæ velocitatis homines.*

65. 9, 4, 9 *esse . . homines . . caninis capitibus . . atque esse . . homines . . vivacissimæ pernicitatis; quosdam etiam esse nullis cervicibus.*

*Capitibus* and *cervicibus* are parts of the body and plural, so, of course, in the Ablative, see page 42. The Genitive is again an abstract.

66. 14, 2, 6 *hominem esse non bonæ rei vitæque turpi et sordida convictumque . .*

*Non bonæ rei* reminds us of *Plaut. Stich. 720 nulli rei erimus* and *Cato Orig. Frg. 141, nulli pro nullius] qui tantisper nulli rei sies, dum nihil agas* and *Cœl. Antip. Frg. 4 alii rei*; for which see further *Bell, De Locativi Usu, p. 53*, who ascribes the phrase to locative origin.

Others interpret as a dative; thus cf. *homo frugi.*

The Ablative *vita* is also reminiscent of the usage of early writers.

67. 17, 9, 7 surculi duo erant teretes, oblonguli, pari crassamento eiusdemque longitudinis.

The use of *pari* and not *paris* is determined by its form, cf. page 27. *Longitudinis* is an abstract and is found elsewhere in the Genitive; cf. Gell. Index Cap. 7, 3 de serpente invisitatæ longitudinis (where the Ablative after *de* would have been less clear) and Liv. 31, 39, 11 rumpiæ ingentis longitudinis.

The lack of any very clear distinction here between the relations to *surculi* of *crassamento* and *longitudinis* suggests the notion that the former, as well as the latter, might have stood in the Genitive, except for lack of the form *paris*.

On the other hand, we may perhaps discern an aim after variety in the choice of the noun form *crassamento* in place of the far more common *crassitudine* which would have given an ending so like that of *longitudinis*.

68. 17, 19, 3 nam cum, inquit, animadverterat hominem pudore amisso, importuna industria, corruptis moribus, audacem, . . . istiusmodi hominem cum viderat.

For *istiusmodi* cf. note to No. 2. For *industria*, notes to Nos. 1 and 10; *pudore*, to Nos. 6 and 23; *moribus*, to No. 49.

69. 19, 9, 1 Adulescens e terra Asia de equestri loco, lætæ indolis moribusque et fortuna bene ornatus et ad rem musicam facili ingenio ac lubenti, cenam dabat.

Here are five circumstances narrated of this young man, each in a different construction! That *indolis* should be in the Genitive is logical. *Ingenio*, on the other hand, is affected by the history of its own past, cf. page 54. Gellius shows here his archaistic tendency, having always the Ablative *ingenio*, never the Genitive *ingenii*. Cf. 1, 5, 3; 2, 18, 3; 4, 15, 2; 6 (7), 3, 8; 10, 18, 6; 12, 4, 1; 13, 25, 21; 13, 30, 3; 17, 15, 2; 19, 8, 6; 19, 9, 1.

70. 19, 9, 2 Antonius Julianus rhetor . . Hispano ore florentisque homo facundiæ et rerum litterarumque veterum peritus.

Again, three descriptive phrases, each in a different construction. But observe, the part of the body, ore, is set as usual in the Ablative, as also ore in 1, 19, 8 *Tarquinius ore iam serio atque attentiore animo fuit*. The abstract quality is again in the Genitive.

Before our next instance after Gellius there is a break of over a hundred years, and the general observation is called for that in that time a change in usage took place by way of limitation in the Ablative. The *Scriptores Historiæ Augustæ*, Aurelius Victor and Eutropius furnish many instances of the Genitive of Quality, few of the Ablative. The first volume of Kroll and Skutsch's new edition of Firmicus Maternus offers, it is true, 30 Ablatives, but of these two-thirds are in the plural and the others, with four exceptions, relate to the body and its description. Palladius has 83 Ablatives, 35 of which are plurals and the rest comprise *crassitudine* and *genitive pedum*, *latitudine*, and the like; parts of the body; *forma*, *facie*, *grano*, *caule*, *folio*, *flore* and once, *corpore*, besides two instances of *hoc genere*; practically all, therefore, relating to bodily description. The *Periochæ* of Livy contain only Genitives. Of the *Scriptores Physiognomici*, who deserve mention because of their abundant use of the constructions in hand, Bartholomeus de Mesana has only one Ablative, and there a variant reading, but many Genitives; while Polemo and the others have Ablatives within a limited range only. The perception of a difference in feeling between Ablative and Genitive, by which a writer could convey a subjective distinction with regard to the object, seems to have decayed and usage seems to have moved along other lines.

We see the illustration of this in the four examples which Lessing quotes (*Studien*, p. 26 ff.).

71. S. H. A. Hadr. 10, 6 *Nulli vitem nisi robusto et bonæ famæ daret nec tribunum nisi plena barba faceret aut eius ætatis, quæ . . .*
72. Ant. Pi. 2, 1 *Fuit vir forma conspicuus [ingenio] clarus moribus, clemens nobilis vultu placidus; ingenio singulari eloquentiæ nitidæ litteraturæ præcipuæ || ingenio cum Reg. del S. ingens Kellerbauer, page 623, singularis B<sup>3</sup> exc.<sup>2</sup> M distinxit S. ||*

73. Pesc. 6, 5 Fuit statura prolixa forma decorus capillo in verticem ad gratiam reflexo, vocis canoræ . . oris verecundi et semper rubidi, cervice adeo nigra.
74. Tyr. 30, 15 fuit vultu subaquilo, fuscī coloris, oculis supra modum vigentibus nigris, spiritus divini venustatis incredibilis.

Observe that all the parts of the body here expressed are in the Ablative and all the Ablatives express parts of the body; except in No. 71, ingenio singulari, where there is a variant singularis, and in No. 73 oris verecundi, which seems a reminiscence of Sallust's famous epigram, cf. note to No. 16, and observe that the adjective rubidus in this connection accords with the phrase of Sacerdos, cited at page 62, coloris erat rubei, though it is uncertain that Sacerdos was earlier than the writer of our passage, Spartianus.

Ingenio in the Ablative is supported by the regular usage, early and late, as noted to No. 8.

75. Firm. Mat. 3, 3, 10 faciet honestis moribus homines et moderatæ dignitatis.
76. 3, 10, 9 faciet . . longioris vitæ et bonæ securitatis et bonis consiliis ac moribus et qui . .
77. 4, 19, 5 faciet homines . . bonos graves, boni consilii . . et qui . . corpore erunt . . languidi et frigido ventri . . sed circa uxores et filios erunt alieno semper affectu.

The Ablatives accord with the usage of the time, being, with the exception of affectu, either plurals, corpore, or parts of the body. Affectu seems to be understood as a transitory quality, but the distinction between transitory and permanent qualities is at this late period no longer commonly felt. "Longioris vitæ et bonæ securitatis et bonis consiliis ac moribus" seems like a translation of three Greek adjectives, perhaps *μακροβιωτέρους* and two compounds with *ἐν*. A genitive morum could not appear for the reasons already mentioned on page 37. Firmicus has moribus elsewhere; 3, 2, 20; 3, 7, 8.

78. Aurel. Vic. Cæs. 18 Hic doctrinæ omnis ac moribus antiquissimus.

Observe, again, the ablative plural moribus. Doctrinæ omnis, sounds like a translation of *πολυῖστωρ*.

79. Pallad. 3, 26, 1 legendi sunt vasti et ampli corporis sed rotundi potius quam longi, ventre et clunibus magnis, rostro brevi, cervice glandulis spissa.
80. 4, 11, 2 ut sint boves novelli, quadratis et grandibus membris et solidi corporis, musculis ac toris ubique surgentibus magnis auribus, latæ frontis et crispæ, labris oculisque nigrantibus cornibus robustis ac sine curvaturæ pravitare lunatis, patulis naribus et resimis, cervice torosa atque compacta, palæaribus largis et circa genua fluentibus pectore grandi, armis vastis, ventre non parvo, porrectis lateribus, latis lumbis, dorso recto et plano, cruribus solidis, nervosis, et brevibus, ungulis magnis, caudis longis ac setosis, pilo totius corporis denso ac brevi, rubei maxime coloris aut fusi.
81. 4, 11, 4 ut sint alti atque ingentibus membris, ætatis mediæ et magis . . torva facie, parvis cornibus, torosa vastaque cervice, ventri substricto.
82. 4, 11, 5 sed eligemus forma altissima corporis longi uteri capacis et magni, alta fronte, oculis nigris et grandibus, pulcris cornibus, et præcipue nigris, aure setosa, palæaribus et caudis maximis, ungulis brevibus et cruribus nigris et parvis, ætatis maxime trimæ, quia, etc.
83. 4, 14, 1 equam magni corporis, solidis ossibus et forma egregia debet eligere.
84. 4, 14, 3 admissarius tamen asinus sit huiusmodi corpore amplo, solido, muscoloso, strictis et fortibus membris, nigri vel murini maxime coloris aut rubei, qui.

85. 7, 7, 7 apes rectoribus cruribus, neque grandibus pennis,  
pulchri coloris et nitidi.
86. 8, 4, 2 arietem . . ventre promisso et lanis candidis tecto,  
cauda longissima, velleris densi, fronte lata  
magnis testibus ætatis trimæ.
87. 12, 13, 7 caper eligendus . . . magni corporis, crassis  
cruribus, brevi plenaque cervice, auribus flexis et  
gravibus, parvo capite nitido spisso et longo  
capillo.
88. 12, 13, 7 capella similis corporis sed magnis uberibus est  
legenda.

In the face of *forma altissima*, *corporis longi uteri capacis et magni*, *alta fronte* (No. 82) and of *magnis auribus*, *latæ frontis et crispi* (No. 80) it is not clear that Palladius felt any subjective distinction between the relation of Ablative and of Genitive to their subjects. It appears also from *solidi corporis* and *corporis longi* that this Genitive expresses here the literal body as well as bodily size, which we saw distinguished by *Nepos*; Dat. 3, 1.

Nor is *corporis* used here in the Ablative after the analogy of the bodily parts, as so often by Pliny, as noted on page 42. Now appears, too, *similis* in the Genitive (No. 88), an example of which for an earlier time would be hard to cite. Palladius even departs so far from the usage of earlier times as to use the Genitive *speciei*, 3, 9, 3 *uvas pulchræ speciei*, discussed under No. 15.

If earlier distinctions have disappeared, does Palladius observe new ones or forsake all? The answer with regard to his Ablatives has been hinted at already. They scarcely extend beyond expressions of the bodily parts, phrases like *crassitudine digiti*, and plurals. Observe that in the ten examples here cited every Ablative is for a part of the body except in No. 84, where *corpore* is for the body itself.

Concerning Palladius' Genitives it is interesting to note that out of 109 instances, 37 are of the termination -*oris*, mostly liquid stems of the 3d declension though including *corporis*. Considering the large number in *modi* and phrases of measure, such as *decem pedum*, this is a very great proportion; far greater than any other author shows.



The suggestion readily arises that Palladius felt for this form a special inclination. This suggestion is strengthened by the occurrence in the Genitive of Quality of adjectives likewise of this form; *maioris* and *tenerioris* more than a dozen times.

The use of the Genitive for abstract qualities is regular, so, *magnitudinis*, *soliditatis*, *qualitatis*, *infelicitatis*, *fecunditatis*.

Remarkable is that while Ablatives are almost limited to parts of the body, parts of the body are not limited to the Ablative. Thus we have 3, 9, 2 *grani tenerioris et umidi* and 3, 9, 3 *grani callosi et siccioris et cutis tenerioris*, beside 3, 8, 4 *grano brevior*; 4, 13, 4 *magni ventris*, beside 4, 11, 2 *ventre non parvo*; 4, 11, 4 *ventre substricto*, 8, 4, 2 *ventre promisso*; 3, 26, 1 *longi lateris* and 4, 9, 14 *soluti lateris*, beside 4, 11, 2 *lateribus*; and 4, 11 2 *latæ frontis*, beside 4, 11, 5 *alta fronte* and 8, 4, 2 *fronte lata*.

Returning now to the instances in hand it is noteworthy that of sixteen Genitives involved, nine are in *-oris*, namely, *coloris*, invariable in Palladius in the Genitive, and *corporis*, also in the Genitive, with one exception, 4, 13, 3, where it is in a phrase rhetorically contrasted with a Genitive *huiusmodi*.

*Huiusmodi* is invariable.

Of the other six Genitives three are of *ætatis*, where it defines a class to which the subject belongs. The remaining three are contrary to rule. *Uteri capacis* (No. 82) may be owing to attraction to the case of the preceding Genitive.

Next come the *Scriptores Physiognomici*, of whom the most important is Polemo, whose usage is in general comparable to that of Palladius. Parts of the body he puts in the Ablative; many of them are in the plural. Otherwise the Genitive is common. But Polemo has Genitives in the plural, and even the rhyme *-orum*, *-orum*, though that seems chiefly to occur in the case of *morum*.

89. Scr. Phys. Polemo, p. 188, 21 (Foerst.) *serpens pavida fugax  
sæpe familiaris celeri mutabilitate deterioris in-  
dolis.*
90. 238, 15 *nigros crispis capillis augustis talis oculis  
stibini coloris nigris capillis.*
91. 272, 3 *vir . . albi coloris rubro mixti, capillo  
simplice . . moderata statura lateribus gravibus,*

. . brachiis plenis . . facie magna non acuta  
tenui carne nec magna oculis umidis et charopis  
et lætitia perfusis.

By the side of Polemo we find in our Codices an anonymous writer, who furnishes us the following examples :

92. Phys. Anon. (Vol. II., F.) 4, 5 tolerans laborum est, vocis  
solidæ aliquanto raucioris . . passibus longis
93. 4, 92 Ingenuosus esse . . coloris albi . . capillo  
flavo . . corpore recto, membris magnis articulis  
discretis, carne moderata, aliquanto molliore . .
94. 4, 94 Impudens . . debet; oculis patentibus lucidis . .  
crassis pedibus et manibus . . rubicundus colore,  
vocis acutæ [acute vocis A].
95. 4, 107 vocem infirmi potius, spiritus || spiritus om. Mo. ||  
quam expressam et claram habet, . . oculis erit  
non perlucidis.
96. 4, 110 γλαφυροῖς membris esse debet . . coloris  
albi, nitidis oculis naribus ex superiore parte ten-  
uioribus.
97. 4, 124 erunt parvi. cavis oculis malæ barbæ, brevibus  
cervicibus, parvorum oculorum, rugosi vultus, . .
98. 4, 130 clamosum, femininæ vocis . . non indecori  
corpore, capite prope rotundo, speciosis oculis,  
cervice procera, incessu pulchri.

The style of our Anonymous differs from that of Polemo, in having fewer Genitives, but we find some which do not appear in Polemo; for instance, speciei and parts of the body in the Genitive, such as, 4, 123 erunt acuti vultus, proscissi oris, longi corporis, acutæ naris, oculorum eminentium.

In the seven examples from Anonymous before us the Ablatives are all corporeal. In five the Genitives are coloris and vocis, neither of which the writer uses consistently. Thus compare colore in 4,

91; 105; 106 with *coloris* in 4, 24; 26; 27; 107, and 110; and *voce* in 4, 91; 98; 102 and 119, with *vocis* in 4, 5, 94; 119, and 130.

In No. 97 complete insensibility to all distinctions appears. *Barbæ* was never before in the Genitive; *rugosi vultus* is decidedly rare and *parvorum oculorum* adds the offense of the rhyme to the irregularity of the Genitive plural for bodily parts; and that, too, after *cavis oculis* in the same sentence.

99. Pseudo Polemon. 5 A 14 *cuius spina dorsi æqua media) magnitudine est, fortis animi est.*

With Pseudo Polemo the Genitive is the more usual, especially of *animi* cf. 5 A 7; 8; 14 (thrice). The rarity of *æquus, æqua*, has been noted already, page 29.

100. Bart. de Mess. (Foerst) 39, 9 *qui est albi coloris et pilosus, rectis capillis et grossis || rectus F, grossus F || et nigr || durus in F., et om. R ||.*

With Bartholomæus, the latest of the *Scriptores Physiognomici*, the decay of early distinctions between Ablative and Genitive seems complete, the Ablative losing its function of expressing parts of the body, cf. 49, 4 *minoris capitis*; 35, 13 *boni menti*; which appear only in the Genitive, even in plurals, cf. 21, 2 *durorum pilorum*; 49, 4 *parvarum costarum*. The Genitive of nouns of the fifth declension is no longer avoided, cf. 41, 8 *obscuræ faciei*; 49, 4 *augustioris faciei*, nor is the rhyme *-orum -orum*, cf. 37, 6 *parvorum membrorum et parvorum articulorum, macer et parvorum oculorum et parvæ faciei*.

If Foerster's reading is correct in our example 100, then it stands alone as having the only Ablative of Quality used by Bartholomæus. The reading of the nominatives *rectus, grossus* and *durus*, with F, would find support in the analogy of 35, 7 *facie remissus*, and may be correct.

This brings us to the end of our chapter. If the evidence accumulated does not give us a simple solution to all the questions raised over our constructions, it does, at least, afford abundant illustration to those views, with the expression of which this chapter was begun.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY.

---

In addition to the complete grammars of Krüger, Zumpt, Madvig, Kühner and Roby; Draeger's *Historische Syntax*; the Landgraf-Schmalz edition of Reisig-Haase; Schmalz's *Grammatik in Müller's Handbuch*; Neue's *Formenlehre*; Nägelsbach's *Stilistik*; Keil's *Grammatici Latini*; the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, and the German and American school grammars, special mention is due the following works:

### ON SPECIAL AUTHORS.

- |                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Bell, Andr.         | De Locativi in prisca Latinitate vi et Usu. Breslau, 1889.                                    |
| Ebrard, Guil.       | De Ablativi Locativi Instrumentalis apud Priscos Scriptores Latinos Usu. Leipzig, Teub. 1879. |
| Holtze, F. W.       | Syntaxis Priscorum Scriptorum Latinorum. Leipzig, 1861.                                       |
| Loch, Edw.          | De Genetivi apud Priscos Scriptores Latinos Usu. Progr. Bartenstein, 1880.                    |
| Schaaf, Albin.      | De Genetivi Usu Plautino. Diss. Halle, 1881.  |
| Heinrichs.          | De Ablativi apud Terentium Usu et Ratione. Elbingæ, 1859.                                     |
| Liebig.             | De Genetivi Usu Terentiano. Oels, 1853.   |
| Holtze, F. W.       | Syntaxis Lucretianæ Lineamena. Leipzig, 1868.   |
| Fischer, Fr. A. Th. | Die Rectionslehre bei Cæsar. (Two programs) Halle, 1853-4.                                    |
| Lupus, Bernh.       | Der Sprachgebrauch des Cornelius Nepos. Berlin, Weidm. 1876.                                  |
| Badstübner.         | De Sallusti Dicendi Genere Commentatio. Prog. Berl., 1863.                                    |
| Christ.             | De Ablativo Sallustiano, Diss. Jena., 1883.   |
| Görlitz.            | De Genetivi Usu Sallustiano. Schrimm, 1878.   |
| Laws, A.            | De Dicendi Genere Sallustiano. Rössel, 1864.  |
| Antoine, F.         | De Casuum Syntaxi Vergiliana. Paris, 1882.  |
| Kern, H.            | Der Ablativ bei Vergil. Schweinfurt, 1881.  |
| Ebeling.            | De Casuum Usu Horatiano. Werningerodæ, 1866.  |

- Kleine. De Genetivi Usu Liviano. Cleve., 1865.  
 Kühnast, L. Die Hauptpunkte der Livianischen Syntax. Berlin, 1872.  
 Riemann, O. Études sur la langue et la Grammaire de Tite Live. Paris, 1884.  
 Lange. Zum Sprachgebrauch des Velleius Paterculus. Putbus, 1878.  
 Müller, Joh. Der Stil des Aelteren Plinius. Innsbruck, 1883.  
 Draeger, A. Ueber Syntax und Stil des Tacitus. Leipzig, 1874.  
 Gantrelle, J. Grammaire et Style de Tacite. Paris, 1874.  
 Kuçera, E. Ueber die Taciteische Inconcinnität. Olmütz, 1882.  
 Schneider. Quæstiones de Ablativi Usu Taciteo. Breslau, 1882.  
 Zernial, U. Selecta Capita ex Genetivi Usu Taciteo. Göttingen, 1864.  
 Lessing, K. Studien zu den Scriptores Historiæ Augustæ. Berlin, 1889.  
 Benesch, J. De Casuum Obliquorum apud Justinum, etc. Vienna, 1889.  
 Lease, E. B. Syntactic, Stylistic and Metrical Study of Prudentius. Baltimore, 1895.

### GENERAL WORKS.

- Aubert, L. C. M. Beiträge zur Lateinischen Grammatik. Christiania, 1856.  
 Bach. Die Lehre vom Gebrauch der Kasus in der Lateinischen Dichtersprache. Gotha, 1848.  
 Bennett, C. E. Appendix to Bennett's Latin Grammar. Boston, 1895.  
 Brenous, J. Étude sur les Hellén dans la Syntaxe latine Paris, 189.  
 Deecke, W. Erläuterungen zur Lateinischen Schulgrammatik. Berlin, 1892.  
 Delbrück, B. Ablativ, localis, instrumentalis im Altindischen, etc. Berlin, 1867.

- Delbrück, B.      Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der-indogermanischen Sprachen. Strassburg, 1897.
- Egbert, J. C.      Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions. New York, 1896.
- Hübner, E. W. E.      Grundriss zur Vorlesungen, etc Berlin, 1889.
- Hübschman, J. H.      Zur Casuslehre. München, 1875.
- Lindsay, W.      The Latin Language. Oxford, 1895.
- Schneider, E.      Dialectorum Italicarum Exempla. Leipzig, 1886.
- Zeiler, G.      Beiträge zur Geschichte des Lateinischen Ablative. Leipzig, 1892.

### PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

- Golling, J.      Zur Lehre vom Ablativ und Genetiv der Eigenschaft. Gymnasium Vol. 6. pp. 2 ff., 42 ff. Paderborn, 1888.
- Stegmann, C.      Zur Lateinischen Schulgrammatik, Neue Jahrb., f. Philologie. Vols. 132, pp. 243-7 and 136, p. 265-9. Leipzig, 1885.
- Wöefflin, E.      Der Genetiv des Wertes und der Ablativ des Preises. Archiv. Vol. 9, pp. 101-8. München, 1896.
- Jahresberichte, Philologus. Vol. 25, pp. 122, 27, 124. Göttingen, 1867.

### SPECIAL LEXICONS.

- Füchner, Franc.,      Lexicon Livianum (A— ). Leipzig, 1894—
- Guerber u. Greef.      Lexicon Taciteum. Leipzig, 1897.
- Merguet, H.      Lexicon zu Cicero's Philosophischen Schriften. Jena, 1887-94.
- Lexicon zu Cicero's Reden. Jena, 1877-84.
- Meusel, H.      Lexicon Caesarianum. Berlin, 1893.
- Segebade et Lommatsch. Lexicon Petronianum. Leipzig, 1898.

## VITA.

I, George Vail Edwards, was born at Riverhead, N. Y., on November 17, 1868. My father, Jeremiah M. Edwards, was a native of Sayville, L. I., and my mother, Susan Vail, a native of Riverhead. After attending the public school in Riverhead until 1884, I went in the following year to Franklinville Academy, to begin under Professor Joseph M. Belford my preparation for college. Entering Hamilton College with the Class of 1891, I graduated after four years with honors, receiving the degree A. B. With the purpose of becoming a teacher of Latin I entered immediately upon post-graduate studies at Cornell University, following courses in Latin under Professors Hale and Elmer ; in Sanskrit under Professor Bristol ; in Archæology under Professor Emerson, and in Roman Life and Comparative Grammar under Professor B. I. Wheeler, my chief adviser being Professor Hale. In the next year I went to Johns Hopkins University, and there for two years pursued the work in Latin, Sanskrit and Greek, under Professors Warren, Bloomfield, Gildersleeve, Smith, Miller and Gudeman, the most attention being devoted to the work of the Latin Seminary and the Sanskrit Seminary, Professor Warren being my chief adviser. In the fall of 1894, before my work at the Johns Hopkins was completed, I accepted a call to the new post of Instructor in Latin at Union College, where I remained three years, taking charge of all the work of the Latin Department in 1895-96, during the absence of my superior, Professor Ashmore. In the summer of 1897 I determined to resume my studies and went to Germany. Two semesters were spent in the University of Munich in the closest touch with Professor Edward Wölfflin who, with the greatest kindness, in his own study furnished me constantly with exceptional advantages for the prosecution of my own work. There was carried forward the present investigation of the *qualitatis* constructions, which had been begun, under the direction of Dr. Warren, before I left the Johns

Hopkins. In Munich, also, I heard the University lectures of Professors Wölfflin, Iwan Müller, Kuhn, Furtwängler and Christ. In the fall of 1898 I traveled in Italy, spending two months in Rome and hearing the lectures of Professors Peck, Merrill and Norton of the American School of Classical Studies. In the spring of 1899 I went again to Baltimore and received in June from the Johns Hopkins University the degree of Ph. D., for which the present dissertation was submitted. The final revision of the manuscript for the press has been made during the winter and spring of 1900 chiefly at the Library of Columbia University, to whose staff I acknowledge indebtedness for many courtesies.





















